

SENATE

SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1932

(Legislative day of Friday, April 29, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3270. An act for the relief of Daniel S. Schaffer Co. (Inc.); and

H. R. 6662. An act to amend the tariff act of 1930, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMOOT. I would prefer not to yield for that purpose. I am compelled to leave the Chamber soon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have noticed in the RECORD some statements made with reference to the Department of Commerce bill and the appropriations made in the past as compared with the appropriations of to-day. I feel that the RECORD ought to be corrected. Therefore I ask for a few moments to do so.

I notice that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] on two or three occasions referred to the Department of Commerce as having asked for \$54,000,000 in appropriations for the fiscal year 1933. In this he is wrong.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, has the Senator notified the Senator from Mississippi that he expected to make this address?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I have not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator just declined to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. It is only a question of figures.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely want to put in the RECORD the actual figures.

The figures the Senator from Mississippi was quoting represent the total appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the current year. The total of the estimates submitted to this Congress for the Department of Commerce for next year was \$44,700,000. It will thus be seen that the department had made a very material cut and had acted on the basis of the \$54,000,000 appropriation just as the Senator from Mississippi suggested it should act.

The Senator also makes reference to the rapid expansion of the department during the period of Mr. Hoover's term as Secretary. A reference to the Budgets shows that for the fiscal year 1913, under the administration of President Wilson, \$15,300,000 was the total appropriation, whereas in 1920 the total appropriation was \$37,000,000, an increase of practically 150 per cent. This is on the same basis of comparison used by critics of the department. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1921 was \$24,200,000, and for the fiscal year 1928, the last one of Mr. Hoover's service as Secretary, the total appropriation was \$37,600,000, or an increase of about 56 per cent. It should be borne in mind that during the period that Mr. Wilson was President there were no new activities created in the Department of Commerce, nor were there any bureaus or agencies transferred to the department from other departments of the Government, whereas a large part of the increased cost during Mr. Hoover's term as Secretary can be easily accounted for in view of the transfer of the Bureau of Mines and the Patent

Office to the department from the Interior Department and the creation through an act of Congress of the aeronautics branch.

In view of the fact that we are now interested in the forthcoming appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce and many claims have been made as to the great increase in its expenditures, we should consider its appropriations in the light of what causes brought about the expansion. During the past three years, under a specific act of Congress for taking the decennial census, over \$39,000,000 have been appropriated in addition to the regular Budget of the Department.

Furthermore, any comparison of this character should take full cognizance of the transfer on January 1, 1923, to the Department of Commerce, under an act of Congress, of 121 employees from the Treasury Department engaged on customs statistics. The Aeronautics Branch, organized through an act of Congress, now has 2,349 employees and requires an appropriation of about \$10,000,000. The Patent Office was transferred to the Commerce Department April 1, 1925, and the Bureau of Mines July 1, 1925, both from the Department of the Interior. The employees of those two units now number 1,442 and 1,020, respectively. They should be excluded in making a comparison of costs over an 11-year period. With these additions taken into consideration, there has been an increase in the eight old bureaus of the department of about 1,700 employees in the 10½ years, or 1.7 per cent a year.

Omitting the extra cost of the census carried in 1922, the eight old bureaus had about \$21,700,000 appropriated for their use, whereas the estimates for 1933 for these same activities call for \$28,250,000, or an increase of about 30 per cent, and practically one-half of this amount is due to the classification of salaries through an act of Congress and subsequent increases on account of what are generally known as the Welch Act and the Brookhart Act. This is exceptionally small for a department which serves the business and marine interests. These increases have been made gradually in response to demands made on the department by industry, and in many instances to take care of duties imposed upon the department by Congress. Secretary Lamont explained this matter in detail before the Appropriations Committee of the House in supporting the estimates for the next fiscal year.

As I mentioned earlier, the increase in the expenditures of the Commerce Department during the past 11 years can be largely explained on the basis of figures over which the Secretaries had no control, but during the eight years under President Wilson there were no factors of this character to be taken into consideration.

In this connection as chairman of the Public Buildings Commission I would like to take occasion to respond to some of the criticisms which have been directed at Mr. Hoover and the present Secretary of Commerce regarding the new Department of Commerce Building in this city. Some critics appear to take keen delight in attempting to hold Mr. Hoover responsible for conceiving the idea of a new building, and for its construction as well as for the expense involved in erection. It would be enlightening to look into the facts.

In the annual report of Secretary Redfield for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, there appears a strong appeal for the construction of a new building to house the activities of the Department of Commerce. This recommendation was repeatedly made subsequently by Mr. Redfield, and in his annual report for 1918 he lists among the urgent needs of the department, "A Government-owned commerce building to house all services except the Bureau of Standards and the laboratory-aquarium of the Bureau of Fisheries."

In the annual report of Secretary of Commerce Alexander for the fiscal year 1920, the necessity for a permanent home for the department is again stressed in the following language:

One of the greatest needs of the department is a permanent home for the proper housing of its several bureaus and divisions. This matter has been repeatedly mentioned by my predecessor, who has covered the subject so thoroughly that I can only em-

phasize what has already been said. The Commerce Building, a rented structure, houses the divisions of the office of the Secretary, three of the department's bureaus, and portions of two others. The building is inadequate to the growing needs of the department, and it is obvious that, with the overcrowding and scattering of activities, results so highly desirable can not be obtained. It is earnestly recommended that steps be taken at an early date looking to the erection of a building suitably adapted to the efficient administration of the department.

Thus it appears that there can be no question as to the unanimous opinion of persons familiar with the activities of the Department of Commerce that the various organizations should be concentrated in one building.

The site upon which the Department of Commerce Building now stands was purchased by the Government in the year 1910 at a total cost of \$2,459,831.08. The act of June 30, 1906, which was amended on May 20, 1908, March 4, 1910, and June 25, 1910, was the authority for the purchase of this site. The purchase was made in 75 parcels, the title to the first being acquired January 27, 1910, and the title to the last parcel December 22, 1910.

In 1910 a competition was held in which commercial architects submitted designs and plans for the construction of a new Department of Commerce and Labor building and other Government buildings which were in contemplation at that time. The committee on awards on January 5, 1911, selected the plans and designs submitted by York & Sawyer for the new Department of Commerce and Labor Building. Questions were then raised as to whether existing legislation was sufficient to proceed with the contracts for the work. Numerous delays then occurred, and finally contracts for plans were canceled. The World War then occurred and caused further delay. It was not until the act of May 25, 1926, when the country was in a state of great prosperity, that legislative authorization was secured for the construction of the building. This authorization was on thorough and scientific study as a part of congressional plans to provide modern and efficient housing facilities, to eliminate the use of rented structures and war-time temporary buildings in a dilapidated condition, to protect invaluable records from irreparable loss by fire, and to bring together activities widely scattered over the city. The design of the building was approved August 16, 1927, and a contract for the first work in connection with the erection of a building was signed October 4, 1927.

The statement has been made that the new building contains 52 acres of floor space. This is probably based upon the gross ground area which the building occupies, without taking into consideration the six large courts. The floor space actually amounts to approximately 36.8 acres instead of 52 acres, as claimed.

The reference to a private elevator with two operators for the Secretary is also wholly misleading. The elevator referred to is available for the use not only of the Secretary of Commerce and his immediate staff but the employees in the whole section of the building in the vicinity of his office, including incoming and outgoing visitors to the entire suite of offices located there. It is difficult to understand the necessity for two operators on a single elevator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMOOT. I would prefer not to do so; I am very anxious to conclude.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just want to ask the Senator how much it costs the Government to run that particular elevator?

Mr. SMOOT. No more than any other elevator that is in the building—not as much as our elevator here in the Capitol.

Mr. McKELLAR. About how much would that be?

Mr. SMOOT. I should think about \$375 a month. There are two employees on it, and then there would be whatever cost of upkeep might be attached to it.

While on this subject, it might be well to state that the claims that there is a watchman whose sole duty is to super-

vise the use of the elevator is untrue. There has never been nor is there now any person exercising any degree of supervision whatever as to the use of the elevator.

The Senator knows there is a private elevator in the Treasury Building, put there when the Treasury Building was first erected. It is operated to-day, and that elevator, I will say to the Senator, is used by the employees of the Government outside of the Secretary of the Treasury's own office.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was addressing his remarks to me, I believe. I want to say to him that this is the first time I ever knew there was a private elevator for the Treasury Department. I do not have as much occasion to use it as the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. But statements of various kinds as to the private elevator in the Department of Commerce Building have been heralded all over the United States and bandied back and forth on both sides of the Chamber, and so I thought I would state the facts in the case.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. SMOOT. I am nearly through.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Department of Commerce Building is such an enormous building for a comparatively recently created department that the size of it, as well as the cost of it, has rather astonished me. Why should we have constructed a building with 46 acres of floor space for the Department of Commerce when we have not done that for any other department of the Government?

Mr. SMOOT. Considering the governmental activities which have been transferred to that department, the floor space per employee will be found to be less than in most of the other Government buildings, I will say to the Senator.

Prior to the removal of various governmental activities to the new quarters, the personnel of the Department of Commerce was located in 14 different buildings scattered throughout the city. In every instance they were overcrowded. In many of the structures occupied by the Government the employees suffered from unbearable heat in summer and low temperature in winter, from drafts and poor ventilation, and from lack of natural light, as well as from congestion and other insanitary conditions.

While the loss to the Government because of scattered and inadequate housing can not be computed with any accuracy, some measure of these losses can be determined by considering individual items. The expense of one of several of our bureaus housed in temporary war-time structures which was forced to close on account of the excessive heat during the summer of 1930—and I might also include the summers of 1927, 1928, and 1929—indicates a direct loss of \$48,091.26. During one of the days of extreme heat I walked through some of those temporary buildings. The temperature was nearly 100°, and I did not see how people could live if they were compelled to spend the afternoon in those buildings under such circumstances. The conditions became so oppressive that it was decided to lay off the employees, and in one temporary building alone the loss thereby caused was \$48,091.26. The same conditions existed during the summer of 1931, and there is no reason to assume that they will not prevail again in the years to come.

The cost of the construction of the Department of Commerce Building has been about \$17,500,000, as authorized by Congress. The cost of the building was 62.5 cents per cubic foot. It is estimated that the annex to the House Office Building, now under construction, will cost 77 cents per cubic foot; the addition to the Senate Office Building will average 93 cents per cubic foot; the Supreme Court Building will cost about \$1.06 per cubic foot; the United States Chamber of Commerce Building in Washington cost 86 cents per cubic foot; the Empire State Building in New York City cost between 70 and 80 cents per cubic foot; the Chrysler Building in the same city cost 80 cents per cubic foot; the Sterick Building in Memphis, Tenn., cost 73.2 cents per cubic foot; the Philtower Building at Tulsa, Okla., 70 cents; the Watts Building, Birmingham, Ala., cost 75.5

cents per cubic foot. These figures regarding the cost of commercial buildings were taken from one issue of a monthly magazine. Undoubtedly hundreds of other instances could be cited if a review of building costs were to be made.

Instead of being in any sense an extravagance, the new Department of Commerce Building represents a decided economy to the Government. This building contains 1,002,631 square feet of office space and 89,370 square feet of storage space, which is sufficient to house all but one of the bureaus of the department which were formerly scattered about the city of Washington. This space at actual current rental values in Washington of \$2.25 per square foot for office space and \$0.40 for storage space represents a total yearly rental value to the Government of \$2,291,665.

I have been compelled on behalf of the Government to sign authorizations for the payment of such rentals for years and years, until I have become very tired of doing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator what instrumentality of the Commerce Department is not housed in the building now? The Senator said one was not. Are not all the bureaus and services now housed in the one department building?

Mr. SMOOT. All that I mentioned are quartered in the new building to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are not paying any rent on the outside at all?

Mr. SMOOT. Not for the buildings which the Government previously occupied.

Mr. McKELLAR. I mean for the Department of Commerce?

Mr. SMOOT. We are not. The actual cost to the Government, however, is considerably less than the amount I just mentioned. Taking into account complete amortization of the construction cost in 40 years (despite the fact that the permanency of construction insures practically indefinite life), interest on the total cost of the building and land, and annual maintenance charges, the yearly cost to the Government amounts to \$1,502,700.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much did we pay in rent?

Mr. SMOOT. Over \$2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a matter of fact, there is quite a considerable saving that ought to be reflected in the pending appropriation bill, ought it not?

Mr. SMOOT. It has been, and much more than that. I referred to the 10 per cent cut—perhaps the Senator was not here at the time—and it means the death of some of the bureaus of that department of our Government. Taking into consideration, also, the annual taxes which would be paid on the land and building if it were owned and operated privately, and the income tax, based on an estimated return of 6 per cent, which would be paid by private owners, the total yearly cost to the Government is \$1,748,032. Thus the saving to the Government, represented by the difference between the total yearly rental value (\$2,291,665) and the total yearly cost (\$1,748,032) is \$543,633, or \$21,745,320 in the 40-year amortization period, an amount substantially in excess of the total cost of the building and land.

The Senator from Mississippi also alluded to the increase in the expenses of the White House under Mr. Hoover, and stated that in 1926, under Mr. Coolidge, the expense amounted to \$483,000, whereas in 1932, under Mr. Hoover, it was \$532,000. This is an increase of \$49,000, or practically 10 per cent. Members of Congress should be somewhat careful about the use of such data, for sooner or later some one is going to call attention to the fact that the appropriation for the Senate in 1926 was \$2,764,000, whereas for 1932 it was \$3,578,000, an increase of \$814,000, or nearly 30 per cent, and that the appropriation for the House was \$6,541,000 in 1926 and \$8,434,000 in 1932, an increase of \$1,893,000, or 28 per cent. I wonder whether we will be able to accomplish reductions in the appropriation for the House

and Senate to bring it down to only a 10 per cent increase over 1926, like the percentage of increase in the expenses of the White House.

Mr. President, I simply wanted the figures I have cited to go into the RECORD.

TAX BURDENS ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, yesterday I called attention to the mounting burden of farm indebtedness which threatens to engulf our agriculture. To-day I want to call attention to another factor in the farm situation which is equally distressing, namely, the enormous burden of taxation now levied upon agriculture. There is no industry in the country that is so tax ridden as agriculture, and there is no other great industry in this country that is less able to pay these taxes than agriculture.

Farm taxes in 1930 were 266 per cent or more than two and one-half times higher than the pre-war level. Mr. President, I wish to insert here a table showing how rapidly and progressively this tax burden has increased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Index numbers of farm taxation (1910-1914=100)	
[Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture]	
Year:	Taxes
1914	100
1915	102
1916	104
1917	106
1918	118
1919	130
1920	155
1921	217
1922	232
1923	246
1924	249
1925	250
1926	253
1927	258
1928	263
1929	267
1930	266

Mr. HOWELL. This table shows that, assuming the taxes paid by the farmer in 1914 were 100, they had increased to 155 in 1920, and in 1930 they had reached 266.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Is not a large part of the increase in the farmer's tax represented by an increase in State taxation?

Mr. HOWELL. There is no question that a large part of the increase in the farmer's tax, especially in the Middle West, is due to the school tax, and also State taxes have increased. I was going to refer to the fact that these taxes were local; but, nevertheless, they are taxes, and they are a tremendous burden upon agriculture.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for just a moment further, let me say that in my native town, which the Senator knows well, Dexter, Mich., a man who came there from the country to take charge of a farmers' cooperative told me, if I remember the figures correctly, that when he moved into Dexter 20 years ago the taxes on his farm were \$60 a year; they are now \$240 a year, and he can not raise as much on that farm, or his tenant can not raise as much, as he formerly did, because the land is depreciating all the time, while all his implements and everything else he has to buy have increased in price. So I know from that one example—and I could cite others—that what the Senator has said is true. The farmer's taxes have enormously increased—increased locally, increased by reason of road appropriations, increased by reason of school taxes, and increased by reason of the enormous advance in the price of implements and materials used by the farmer.

Mr. HOWELL. I wish to say to the able Senator from New York that Michigan statistics afford a glaring example of the high ratios of the farmer's taxes to his income.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRATTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I was impressed with what the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] said. The country generally is looking to us for a reduction of the burden of taxation on the farmers. I have been examining that question, and I find that in my own State, while the Federal Government during the last 10 years, until the depression came upon us, has reduced taxes almost one-third per capita, my own State has increased State taxes three times. The same thing is pretty generally true throughout the country; and yet the citizens of America seem to feel that Congress is responsible for the increased taxation.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, even before the present depression, farm taxes were absorbing a large percentage of farm returns. Taxes absorbed 32.6 per cent of the rentals on Colorado farms in 1926; 29.8 per cent of the rentals on South Dakota farms in 1926; 20 per cent in Virginia; 54.3 per cent in Michigan in 1925; 41 per cent in Ohio in 1922; 27 per cent in Iowa in 1927. Undoubtedly the situation is much worse to-day.

A study of farm taxes in Wisconsin showed that in 1927 a total of 2,593,163 acres, or nearly one-fourth of the entire area of 17 northern counties in Wisconsin, were offered for sale for tax delinquency. Over five-sixths of this area had not been redeemed by the owners within almost a year following the sale. In one county, for example, delinquent taxes increased 600 per cent since 1919.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I desire to add just one other note about the Michigan situation.

There is a little weekly paper published in Dexter, my native town, called "The Dexter Leader." I learned to set type in the office of that paper as an office boy and have been interested in it all these years. Prior to the last two or three years I do not remember seeing in that paper more than half a column of mortgage sales. It is shocking to read it now and find whole page and often a page and a half of mortgage sales in that small community, where the farmers have just given up, been unable to meet their payments, and mortgage sales have been advertised.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. LONG. The figures which the Senator presents are very striking, showing the amount of taxes, as the Senator from New York calls attention to, that are being placed upon the farmers. Nevertheless, practically none of these taxes, I take it, are such that the farmers do not need to levy them in order to take care of community requirements, such as school taxes.

Does not that suggest—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New York on that point, as in line with our President's speech at Indianapolis—that the need of this country is not to take away from these people what they have, but to impose these taxes at the top, so that the big money-makers of this country could supply what is needed in this country, and not to have them falling at the bottom? Does it not suggest the need of such things as surtaxes on annual incomes and inheritance taxes such as would relieve the people at the bottom of farm life and labor life from having to carry such a burden of taxes as that?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, not only have the farmers suffered from increased taxes, but the same condition has been prevalent throughout our cities. I have heard many complaints respecting taxes here in Washington, and yet the people of Washington do not know what taxation means. I can point out cities where the tax rate is 4 per cent on the assessed valuation; but, of course, to interpret such tax rates it is necessary in each case to know what proportion

the assessed valuation bears to the actual valuation. I know, however, that in my city, where the assessed valuation is very close to the actual valuation, the taxes this year will be about 3.2 per cent, as compared to about 1.90 per cent here in the city of Washington.

Mr. President, in Mississippi recently, I am informed, 60,000 farm homes, aggregating more than 7,000,000 acres, and constituting one-fourth of the farm lands of the State, were sold or offered for sale by 82 sheriffs for taxes.

Renick W. Dunlap, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in an address some months ago visualized the enormity of the farm-tax burden by pointing out that farmers yield every fifth day of their time in support of the Government; or, to put it another way, farmers work one year out of every five years in order to pay their taxes. In certain sections of the country taxes have risen so high, he explained, that they amount to the total value of the land every nine years. "In other words," he stated, "the farmers in those sections must buy their farms and pay for them every nine years." The total tax burden of the farmers is estimated at more than \$1,000,000,000 annually, which is equivalent to \$3,000,000 a day. "There is not any other industry in the United States whose taxes in any way compare with those of agriculture," he declared.

These tax burdens would be heavy enough in a period of high prices; but with the farm price level so disastrously low, farm taxes in many sections are virtually confiscatory, as shown by the large number of farms which have already been taken over by the States for unpaid taxes. How can the farmers expect to pay their taxes on 30 to 50 cent wheat, 5 to 10 cent eggs, 15-cent butter, and 5-cent cotton?

We hear a great clamor on every hand that the Federal Budget be balanced. I agree that this should be done; but if an equal amount of energy and diligence were applied to assisting the farmers of the Nation to balance their budget, we should have very little difficulty in balancing the Federal Budget. If agriculture were restored to prosperity by restoring its price level, our factories could be reopened, and large numbers of the unemployed could return to work to supply the needs of 44 per cent of our population, including other ruralists than farmers. The restoration of the farm purchasing power, and the revival of industry which would result therefrom, would restore the sources of Government revenue which have dried up as a result of the depression.

The most effective way to balance the Federal Budget and to create a surplus is to restore prosperity to the people of the country. We can not collect taxes from people who have no income. This Congress is spending too much time treating results instead of remedying causes. It is of little avail to give relief for rheumatic pains so long as the infection causing the pain is allowed to run rampant. Similarly, it is of little avail for us to extend credit to distressed agriculture and do nothing to remove the causes of its difficulties.

I recognize that the farm taxes to which I have alluded are largely local, not Federal. However, they are no less a fact; and there must be added thereto the indirect taxes of a Federal origin paid by the farmer.

What I want to emphasize is the enormous burden, in addition to his indebtedness, which the farmer is carrying, notwithstanding his buying power has been reduced one-half. The last report of the Department of Agriculture respecting farm indexes and what the farmer must pay for what he purchases indicates that he is receiving 59, as compared with 100, in 1914, and that he is paying for the things he buys 114, as compared to 100 in 1914. This injustice so far as his buying power is concerned rests squarely upon our national, social fabric, because it is not a question of the production of wealth, but of the distribution of wealth. For that reason the farmer is properly appealing for relief to Congress, the authority which has been created by the politico-social organization we call the United States to deal with such questions and appeals.

Mr. President, what are we going to do about it? As I have stated before, we have been in session nearly five months, and there is little more than a month remaining of the session. Not one constructive measure has been en-

acted into law to aid the farmer. He has been loaned money in certain sections of the country, where, through drought or grasshoppers or other cause, he has not had even the seed with which to plant his farm. But, Mr. President, that is simply treating a symptom, and it is something that might occur at any time. We have authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan a certain proportion of its assets to agricultural credit associations; but the farmer has borrowed too much money already. What he needs is to earn some money.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the Senator is entirely right. These men do not want to borrow money. They want markets for their crops. They want to sell them, and I find that this great problem of the farm is not located west of the Alleghenies alone. I may say to the Senator that I am having most appealing letters from farm homes in my own State of New York. We stand eighth in agriculture. We have diversity of crops in my section; but, in spite of that, there is great distress in the farm homes of New York, and I share with the Senator his thought that some solution must be found.

If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I was much interested in the bill which the Senator presented the other day, the purpose of which, as I understand, is to make a test in one crop of the McNary-Haugen principle of the equalization fee in order that there may perhaps be a court test to determine its constitutionality. I am correct in that, am I?

Mr. HOWELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COPELAND. Every time I had an opportunity—I do not know whether it was two or three or four times—I voted for that bill because, as I see it, the equalization fee, being a variable amount, would act to discourage overproduction. Almost every scheme for farm relief that has been presented here has been one which, in the ultimate analysis, would increase production, and thus increase the evil, certainly not relieve it. It might relieve the symptoms, as the Senator has said, for a little while, but the cause of the disease would not be removed.

I hope the Senator will press that bill. I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am glad to support it, because I would like to see that plan tried. I discussed it time and time again with the Senator from Oregon, who worked so diligently at the time it was pending, from the beginning. We ought to make a test of it. All these other things have failed. Nothing we have done so far has been of any value whatever to the farmer.

The farmer's distress has increased from year to year, ever since we have tried to do anything, and it has increased out of proportion to the increase of distress in other walks of life. So I hope the Senator will press that measure, and that we may hope to have the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry report upon it so that it may be enacted into law, if possible, this coming month, because something must be done.

I agree fully with the Senator that the prosperity of the farmer determines the prosperity of the country. When there is an inability on the part of the farmer to sell his products, there are bread lines in my city. We have a common interest. I know I speak for the teeming millions of my city when I say that we realize there the necessity of the farmer, and we want to do what we can to aid him.

As the Senator has said, there is no relief in lending money to the farmer; it simply puts the farmer more into debt. It means he never will work out his problem. So I hope the Senator will press his proposed legislation, and let us have a test of that particular measure, in order that we may see whether or not it will operate to give some measure of relief.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I have not here on the floor, during the remarks I have made upon several occasions respecting agriculture, advocated a particular measure. I have merely advocated the enactment of some constructive measure for the benefit of the farmer, and I am willing to

accept anything that is offered that promises relief. What I am here talking about is that we have not done anything, that there is nothing before us, that the adjournment of Congress is near at hand, and I fear that we will close this session without even attempting to do anything constructive for the farmer. Each political party will have violated its promise to the farmers of the country, as set forth in the 1928 platforms.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I beg to differ with the Senator. I think all political parties have kept their pledge to agriculture. They pledged themselves to see that agriculture and industry were placed upon an equality, and they have brought industry down to where agriculture was.

Mr. HOWELL. I beg the Senator's pardon. Industry is getting 114 for its products, as compared with 59 the farmer is getting. Conditions have brought industry down to 114, but while doing so the farmer has been reduced to 59.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Industry is on the road to bankruptcy with the farmer. They have not traveled quite so long as the farmer has in that direction, but they are getting down to equality.

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; but it is largely the 59 the farmer is receiving that is causing bankruptcy for industry.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Oh, yes; I agree with the Senator. Industry took so much from 1920 to 1930 that they destroyed their own markets, destroying the purchasing power of agriculture and labor as well.

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; the differential against the farmer nearly killed the goose that lays the golden egg.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Some of us advocated the export debenture for agriculture. Does he not think that would be a help to agriculture, if we adopted it right now?

Mr. HOWELL. I advocated the export debenture plan when it was before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Senator think it would be helpful right now?

Mr. HOWELL. It would be, if the Treasury could stand it; but it would simply be pulling out another bung from the Treasury barrel at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anything is going to cost money that will do the farmer any good, is it not?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; but the question is not what we want in the way of legislation but what we can get. At this time I have no hope that Congress, endeavoring to fill up the Treasury, will adopt a plan which, as I suggested, would remove another bung from the Treasury barrel.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me interrupt the Senator further. The Senate on two occasions adopted the debenture, and it would now be the law, except for the administration and the old House of Representatives, which was controlled by the administration. I wanted to call that to the Senator's attention when he was saying that both parties had broken their pledges. We tried to do it, but we could not do it because the administration and the former House of Representatives would not let us do it. Is not that true?

Mr. HOWELL. It is true; but what I am urging now is that we have been in session for five months, and we have not attempted to do anything for the farmer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HOWELL. We are about to adjourn; and I ask, Are we going to do anything? What does the Senator think about it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think that the Congress or the Senate is going to do anything, because I do not think the administration will let Congress do anything.

Mr. HOWELL. Does the Senator feel that because he thinks the administration would defeat any plan we passed we should not act?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; and I was calling the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senate did act on two occa-

sions, but the administration defeated the plan. The Senator is stating that the plan he suggests would cost money. Has he any plan that will not cost something? We ought to go on and do our duty regardless of the administration, and I think the debenture is the only thing we could now do to open up foreign channels, and I am for it. I would vote for it to-morrow, and I am wondering whether the Senator would not vote for it to-morrow?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I am ready to vote for any measure that will aid the farmer. I am talking about a constructive measure. I am not talking about lending the farmer more money, or giving him more money, or donating more wheat.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. There is a measure before Congress, I will say to the Senator, which would help. The trouble with the debenture is that there is not the money in the Treasury to take care of it. The further trouble is that too much taxes are on the backs of the weak. But we can supply the funds the Treasury needs for the debenture and to relieve the lower crust of this country of tax burdens if we will adopt a resolution instructing the Finance Committee not to allow wealth to be accumulated in the hands of a handful of people. In other words, instead of allowing 504 men to earn \$1,185,000,000, if we will let those 504 men earn \$504,000,000, and throw approximately \$700,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States, we will have money enough to support the debenture, and along the same line, we would have money enough to relieve the people of some of the taxes they are having to pay.

You can form any kind of a law you want to form chipping around at the top of the tree, but the only thing that is going to cure the farm-relief problem is the providing of money in the Treasury of the United States to assist the farmers; and the only way by which we can do that is by putting the taxes at the top. The only way we can cure this situation is to break up this abnormal, criminal, swollen-fortune system of the United States. That is the only cure, and a measure looking to that end is before this Congress. But it has as much chance of passing as a snowball has of going through a fireplace.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, assuming that what the Senator from Louisiana has been saying is true, he admits it could not get through Congress; and I call the Senate's attention again to the fact that it does not make any difference what kind of legislation we want, if we want to get something, we will have to find something that will pass Congress.

As to the suggestion of the Senator from Texas that we apply the debenture plan, that would mean reducing the net income from duties which would otherwise reinforce the Treasury, while we are trying to fill up the Treasury. I do not believe Congress would consent at the present time, or that we could prevail upon the Congress within the next month, to pass a bill of that kind—neutralizing part of our efforts to fill the Treasury.

That is not the only possible form of relief which might be afforded, however. It is a fact that the production of wealth is governed by invariable laws. We can not by legislation change the rainfall, the fertility of the soil, the efficiency of the farmer. There are invariable laws governing those things. But when it comes to the distribution of wealth—and that is the farmer's trouble—the laws governing the distribution of wealth are not invariable. They are just what society makes them.

Mr. LONG. That is right.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the laws governing the distribution of wealth have been different in different ages; they are different in different countries to-day; and they can be still more different if society sees fit to make the change.

Congress, so far as the United States is concerned, is the agency of society to whom has been given the power and authority to do just that sort of thing. And we have done it. The railroads came to us in 1920 and said, "We are not

getting our share of the national income. We want you to fix prices for us so that we will get our share of the national income." And Congress did it, not indirectly but directly, for the first time in our history. By doing so, they changed the distribution of wealth in this country in a measure. They compelled more money to go out of the shipper's pockets and into the railroad's pockets than had gone before.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, in every one of the States, or in nearly all of them, there have been public-service commissions created which have fixed prices for electric-power plants for the past two or three decades. They have indulged in price fixing pure and simple, and what has been the consequence? Notwithstanding the present depression the power plants of this country had their banner year in 1930, so far as income was concerned. Last year the amount of income received by those electric power companies was only 1.2 per cent below what it was in 1930 and was 1.5 per cent more than it was in 1929, the banner year in the matter of gross income for the operating power companies of this country.

Senators will recall that the other day in New York Mr. Insull, president of the Midwest Utilities Co., in a plea in abatement respecting the receivership that had overtaken the Midwest, said that its operating companies had had their best year in 1931. The cause of the failure of the Midwest Utilities Co. was that it had \$37,000,000 of short-time paper coming due June 1 which it could not meet.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wanted to call the attention of the Senator, because he mentioned high freight rates and the distribution of wealth, to the fact that before the Commerce Committee, of which the Senator is a member, there is pending a bill to provide for the completion of inland waterways in the hope of bringing an end to the embargo on goods which can not move on account of high railroad freight rates. The Senator talks of a program that the Congress ought to enact to remedy the evils from which we are suffering and to change the policies we have pursued which have brought us to the condition in which we now find ourselves.

I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think that one of the steps that ought to be taken is the completion of the inland waterways, so the people who are suffering from high freight rates may enjoy the lower cost of transportation which those waterways would afford?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I agree that we should go just as far as practicable in the improvement of our inland waterways for the purpose of reducing the freight that is paid by the agricultural interests upon their products to get those products to the seaboard; but while we are now considering the bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota we have also been considering a bill to fix the prices for intercoastal shipping, something that has never been done before. We have a measure before the Commerce Committee which proposes another element changing the factors affecting the distribution of wealth in this country, because when we fix prices we necessarily affect the distribution of wealth, or else the fixing of prices would be futile.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HASTINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator has alluded to the difficulties of agriculture. One of the difficulties is the low price level and the purchasing power of our dollar. I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think this measure would very greatly assist agriculture and solve perhaps our present credit problem? I refer to the bill S. 4229, which I introduced and which declares it to be policy

of the United States that the average purchasing power of the dollar as ascertained by the Department of Labor in the wholesale market for the year 1926 shall be restored and maintained by the expansion and contraction of credit and currency through the powers of the United States and its agencies.

I think if we could enact that legislation it would very greatly assist agriculture, because it would raise the price level of commodities. The bill provides a way of doing it, and makes it the duty of the Federal Reserve Board and other agencies of government to carry out that policy. I think that would be a very great help in fixing the purchasing power of the dollar at the index of 1926. There were 560 commodities examined for the years 1922 up to and including 1929, and the average is the year 1925. If we stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar at that figure and authorize and direct and make it mandatory for the Federal Reserve Board, through its agencies and the other agencies of government, to maintain it by expansion and contraction of credit at that index, I think our financial problem would be largely solved and it would greatly take care of the interest of agriculture.

Mr. HOWELL. I will say to the able Senator from Florida that I agree with him. I think most economists are agreed that whenever there is expansion of currency such as took place during the war, there is a rise in the commodity level, and that with a contraction of currency there is a fall in commodity level. If we are to judge the economic future of man by the past, as we do the political history of mankind, what is our fate?

Considering a comprehensive graph indicating commodity prices, we will note that after the inflation of 1815, following the Napoleonic wars, commodity prices continued to fall for 30 years. I do not mean to say that there were not some periods of prosperity in between, but every 10 years the commodity levels were lower than they were at the beginning of that 10-year period.

What took place in 1864? For 30 years after that inflation there was a fall in commodity level. If we are to judge the economic future by the economic past of man, what is going to take place? Why, we have just started on a period of fall in commodity prices. We have only covered 12 years of those 30 years. We have 18 years to go. Whereas some of the ablest economists will urge that they hope this will not be our fate, none of them will prophesy positively to the contrary. Unless something is done such as the Senator from Florida has proposed, we are probably in for a period of falling prices during which we may have periods of prosperity, but they will occur on a falling market.

That is what has affected agriculture. But for industrial products we have maintained the prices through the tariff. By effective legislation we have fixed and maintained prices for railroad services so that during the last nine years ending with 1931 they have been able to pay \$3,500,000,000 in dividends, and I am merely speaking of class 1 roads, and moreover they put aside \$2,500,000,000 of surplus.

But how with the farmer? As I pointed out yesterday, whereas his mortgage indebtedness in 1910 was only a little more than \$3,000,000,000, it had risen to \$9,500,000,000 last year. We have been fixing prices for others, but there is not the will of Congress, apparently, to do as much for the agricultural industry. True, we say to the farmer "We have given you a tariff just as we have given industry a tariff," but he answers, "A tariff on steel means what to me? It means that an industry with less than 20 concerns in the business is able to control its prices because they can have their managers or other representatives gather together at luncheon every noon for the adjustment of prices." Then he points out that one of those 20 concerns produces more than one-half of all the steel, and the consequence is that the 19 others wisely conclude that intelligent cooperation is the best thing for them.

But the farmer continues and says, "There are 6,300,000 farm factories in this country, and we can not get together." There are certain bovines—among them the yak—that can

not consume corn while our domestic cattle can. The situation is like saying to the owner of bovines of that character, "Here is corn, a well-known food for cattle." He answers, "It does not do for my stock." But, we urge, "It is feed." "Yes," he would reply, "it is feed for some, but not for my stock."

So it is with the tariff. It is a help for industry with limited numbers of concerns producing different products, but it is little help so far as price-fixing is concerned, in the case of an industry including 6,300,000 farm factories. We have not treated the farmer with equality in fact; only apparently, that is all.

Mr. President, I had not intended to extend my remarks as I have, but I again want to ask what we are going to do about it. Are we going to adjourn without doing for the farmer? Remember, he knows that if the will is in Congress to act, it can act, and that the excuse that the Executive may not cooperate is not valid—it is merely passing the buck. Only a little more than a month remains of this session of the Congress. Something must be done or we will have to go back and tell the farmer "There is no hope for you. Congress will not act."

The farmer was once a serf. He became a peasant. Not until he came to this country did the farmer develop as we have known him. What took place in this country? For decades upon decades he was subsidized with cheap land, free land, but that subsidy ceased along about the beginning of this century. Now he is dependent for his income upon the profits of the operation of his farm. Those profits have never been large. In fact, such returns have always been below those which are the lot of other industries. Back in the minds of many is the thought, "How can we help the farmer? History will repeat itself; he is on his way down the economic scale; it is his fate. And, Mr. President, history is beginning to repeat itself."

In closing, I want to invite attention once again that the question involved is one of the distribution of wealth and not of the production of wealth. We are affecting the distribution of wealth constantly here in the Halls of Congress, and the question is whether we are willing to alter the rules and laws controlling the distribution of wealth in behalf of the farmer. If not, let us tell him so, and we will tell him so if this Congress adjourns next June without constructive action in agriculture's behalf.

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines, salaries, and general expense," on page 103, line 23, after the name "District of Columbia," to insert "including maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle for general bureau use"; on page 104, line 1, after the designation "Secretary of Commerce," to strike out "\$80,350" and insert "\$70,000"; and in line 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$72,945" and insert "\$63,945," so as to read:

Salaries and general expenses: For general expenses, including pay of the director and necessary assistants, clerks, and other employees, in the office in the District of Columbia, and in the field, and every other expense requisite for and incident to the general work of the bureau in the District of Columbia, including maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle for general bureau use, and in the field, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, \$70,000, of which amount not to exceed \$63,945 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 18, after the word "aprons," to strike out "\$435,325" and insert "\$440,325," so as to read:

Investigating mine accidents: For investigations as to the causes of mine explosions, causes of falls of roof and coal, methods of mining, especially in relation to the safety of miners, the appliances best adapted to prevent accidents, the possible improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, the use of explosives and electricity, the prevention of accidents, statistical studies and reports relating to mine accidents, and other inquiries and technologic investigations pertinent to the mining industry, including all equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel and subsistence, purchase not exceeding \$2,400, exchange as part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots, and aprons, \$440,325, of which amount not to exceed \$77,310 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, at the end of line 4, to strike out "\$10,835" and insert "\$9,000," so as to read:

Mining investigations in Alaska: For investigations and the dissemination of information with a view to improving conditions in the mining, quarrying, and metallurgical industries as provided in the act authorizing additional mining experiment stations, approved March 3, 1915 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 8), and to provide for the inspection of mines and the protection of the lives of miners in the Territory of Alaska, including personal services, equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel and subsistence, \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 1, before the word "for," to strike out "\$17,440" and insert "\$15,640"; and in line 2, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$340,355" and insert "\$306,000," so as to read:

Operating mine-rescue cars and stations: For the investigation and improvement of mine rescue and first-aid methods and appliances and the teaching of mine safety, rescue, and first-aid methods, including the exchange in part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of mine rescue trucks, and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, the expenditure for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles not to exceed \$4,200, the construction of temporary structures and the repair, maintenance, and operation of mine rescue cars and Government-owned mine rescue stations and appurtenances thereto, personal services, traveling expenses and subsistence, equipment, and supplies; travel and subsistence, and other incidental expenses of employees in attendance at meetings and conferences held for the purpose of promoting safety and health in the mining and allied industries; the purchase and exchange in part payment thereof of cooks' uniforms, goggles, gloves, and such other articles or equipment as may be necessary in the operation of mine rescue cars and stations, including not to exceed \$15,640 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$306,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 17, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$136,000" and insert "\$155,000," so as to read:

Testing fuel: To conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of mineral fuels, and for investigation of mineral fuels belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient utilization; to recommend to various departments such changes in selection and use of fuel as may result in greater economy, and upon request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to investigate the fuel-burning equipment in use by or proposed for any of the departments, establishments, or institutions of the United States in the District of Columbia, \$155,000, of which amount not to exceed \$30,700 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 9, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$145,000," so as to read:

Mineral mining investigations: For inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and mineral substances, other than fuels, with a view to improving health conditions and increasing safety, efficiency, economic development, and conserving resources through the prevention of waste in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting these industries; and including all equipment, supplies, expenses of travel and subsistence, and the purchase, not to exceed \$2,500, including exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, including not to exceed \$17,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$145,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 3, after the word "aprons," to strike out "\$146,215" and insert "\$200,000," so as to read:

Oil and gas investigations: For inquiries and investigations and dissemination of information concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, including economic conditions affecting the industry, with a view to economic development and conserving resources through the prevention of waste; for the purchase of newspapers relating to the oil, gas, and allied industries: *Provided*, That section 192 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 102) shall not apply to such purchase of newspapers from this appropriation; and for every other expense incident thereto, including supplies, equipment, expenses of travel and subsistence, purchase, not to exceed \$7,000, exchange as part payment for, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots, and aprons, \$200,000, of which amount not to exceed \$24,940 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 15, before the word "of," to strike out "\$220,000" and insert "\$200,000," and in line 16, before the word "may," to strike out "\$15,700" and insert "\$14,200," so as to read:

Mining experiment stations: For the employment of personal services, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots and aprons, the purchase not to exceed \$3,000, exchange as part payment for, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, and all other expenses in connection with the establishment, maintenance, and operation of mining experiment stations, as provided in the act authorizing additional mining experiment stations, approved March 3, 1915 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 8), \$200,000, of which amount not to exceed \$14,200 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, at the end of line 25, to strike out "\$78,185" and insert "\$70,000," so as to read:

Buildings and grounds, Pittsburgh, Pa.: For care and maintenance of buildings and grounds at Pittsburgh and Bruceton, Pa., including personal services, the purchase, exchange as part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger automobiles for official use, and all other expenses requisite for and incident thereto, including not to exceed \$5,000 for additions and improvements, \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 1, after the word "including," to strike out "a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle" and insert "motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles," so as to read:

Government fuel yards: For the purchase and transportation of fuel; storing and handling of fuel in yards; maintenance and operation of yards and equipment, including motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for inspectors, purchase of equipment, rentals, and all other expenses requisite for and incident thereto, including personal services in the District of Columbia, the unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for these purposes is reappropriated and made available for such purposes for the fiscal year 1933, and for payment of obligations for such purposes of prior years, and of such sum not exceeding \$500 shall be available to settle claims for damages caused to private property by motor vehicles used in delivering fuel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$17,000," and in line 4, to strike out "\$61,020" and insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

For investigations of resources of helium-bearing gas and the conservation thereof, and of processes and methods of producing, storing, purifying, and utilizing helium and helium-bearing gas, including supplies and equipment, stationery, furniture, expenses of travel and subsistence, purchase, not exceeding \$1,200, exchange as part payment for, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots and aprons, and all other necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$17,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 12, before the word "of," to strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$250,000," so as to read:

Economics of mineral industries: For inquiries and investigations, and the dissemination of information concerning the economic problems of the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, with a view to assuring ample supplies and efficient distribution of the mineral products of the mines and quarries, including studies and reports relating to uses, reserves, production, distribution, stocks, consumption, prices, and market-

ing of mineral commodities and primary products thereof; preparation of the reports of the mineral resources of the United States, including special statistical inquiries; and including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of furniture and equipment; stationery and supplies; typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs; newspapers; traveling expenses; purchase, not exceeding \$1,200, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, \$250,000, of which amount not to exceed \$221,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 23, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$2,500," so as to read:

For the purchase or exchange of professional and scientific books, law books, and books to complete broken sets, periodicals, directories, and other books of reference relating to the business of the Bureau of Mines, there is hereby made available from any appropriations made for such bureau not to exceed \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$1,000," so as to read:

For necessary traveling expenses of the director and employees of the bureau, acting under his direction, for attendance upon meetings of technical, professional, and scientific societies, when required in connection with the authorized work of the Bureau of Mines and incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce, there is hereby made available from any appropriations made to the Bureau of Mines not to exceed in all \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 7, to change the total appropriation for the Bureau of Mines from \$1,858,335 to \$1,895,325.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV.—Department of Labor, office of the Secretary," on page 116, line 12, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$201,060; in all, \$216,060" and insert "\$185,000; in all, \$200,000," so as to read:

Salaries: Secretary of Labor, \$15,000; Assistant Secretary, Second Assistant Secretary, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$185,000; in all, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor," on page 117, line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$61,800" and insert "\$55,500," so as to read:

For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the department, for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are not specifically made, including the purchase of stationery, furniture, and repairs to the same, carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, laundry, street-car fares not exceeding \$200; lighting and heating; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor cycles and motor trucks; maintenance, operation, and repair of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; newspaper clippings not to exceed \$1,800, postage to foreign countries, telegraph and telephone service, typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices; purchase of law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, not exceeding \$5,000; in all \$55,500; and in addition thereto such sum as may be necessary, not in excess of \$25,000 to facilitate the purchase, through the central purchasing office as provided in the act approved June 17, 1910 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 7), of certain supplies for the Immigration Service, shall be deducted from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Immigration" made for the fiscal year 1933 and added to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor," for that year; and the total sum thereof shall be and constitute the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of Labor, to be expended through the central purchasing office (Division of Publications and Supplies), Department of Labor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, at the end of line 14, to strike out "\$275,000" and insert "\$240,000," so as to read:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Department of Labor, including all its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics," on page 118, line 25, after the word "bureau," to strike out "\$533,337" and insert "\$450,000," and on page 119, line 1, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$434,830" and insert "\$370,030," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For personal services, including temporary statistical clerks, stenographers, and typewriters in the District of Columbia, and including also experts and temporary assistants for field service outside of the District of Columbia; traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor; purchase of periodicals, documents, envelopes, price quotations, and reports and materials for reports and bulletins of said bureau, \$450,000, of which amount not to exceed \$370,830 may be expended for the salary of the commissioner and other personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Immigration," on page 120, line 1, before the word "all," to strike out "\$10,519,460" and insert "\$9,500,000," and in line 3, before the word "may," to strike out "\$385,530" and insert "\$300,000," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For enforcement of the laws regulating the immigration to, the residence in, and the exclusion and deportation from the United States of aliens, and persons subject to the Chinese exclusion laws; salaries, transportation, traveling, and other expenses of officers, clerks, and other employees appointed to enforce said laws; care, detention, maintenance, transportation, and traveling expenses incident to the deportation and exclusion of aliens, and persons subject to the Chinese exclusion laws, as authorized by law, in the United States and to, through, or in foreign countries; purchase of supplies and equipment, including alterations and repairs; purchase, exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled vehicles, including passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts and digests thereof for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; refunding of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, registry fees, and reentry permit fees, upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection and deposit was made through error of Government officers; and for all other expenses necessary to enforce said laws; \$9,500,000, all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, of which amount not to exceed \$300,000 may be expended for the salary of the Commissioner General and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including services of persons authorized by law to be detailed there for duty, and \$2,194,180 shall be available only for coast and land border patrol.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the amendment in line 1, page 120, may be disagreed to and that the amendment which I send to the desk may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 120, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "\$9,500,000" and insert "\$9,450,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. On page 120, in line 7, after the word "and," I move to amend by inserting the words "not to exceed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 120, line 7, after the word "and," where it occurs the first time, it is proposed to insert the words "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. In the same line I move to strike out the word "only."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 120, line 7, after the word "available," it is proposed to strike out the word "only," so as to read:

Shall be available for coast and land border patrol.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee why he desires to strike out the word "only" in line 7?

Mr. JONES. The bill as reported reads:

And \$2,194,180 shall be available only for coast and land border patrol.

It was not thought wise to limit that appropriation to a particular use, but we do authorize the department to use

the \$2,194,180 for that purpose unless it deems it wise to use some part of it for some other purpose along the same line. In other words, as the language originally was, the department would have had to use every dollar of it for that particular purpose or not use it at all. So we have left the discretion in the department, but have provided the same amount.

Mr. COPELAND. The money will be used, however, for the coast and land border patrol in the same manner?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. So it does not change the real effect of the appropriation?

Mr. JONES. No; I do not think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington. The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the items for the expenses of the Bureau of Immigration, on page 120, line 8, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$92,250" and insert "\$80,000"; in line 11, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$92,250" and insert "\$80,000"; and in line 12, after the word "than," to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$70,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$80,000 of the sum herein appropriated shall be available for the purchase, including exchange, of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and of such sum of \$80,000 not more than \$70,000 shall be available for the same purposes for the coast and land border patrol.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for expenses of the Bureau of Immigration, on page 120, line 22, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$65,000," so as to make the further proviso read:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$65,000 of the total amount herein appropriated shall be available for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 818), not to exceed \$1,700 for any person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, at the end of line 5, to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to read:

Immigration stations: For remodeling, repairing (including repairs to the ferryboat *Ellis Island*), renovating buildings, and purchase of equipment, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Naturalization," on page 122, line 5, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "\$1,075,770" and insert "\$975,770," and in line 6, before the word "may," to strike out "\$239,260" and insert "\$215,000," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For the expenses of carrying on the work of the Bureau of Naturalization, as provided in the acts authorizing a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and establishing the Bureau of Naturalization, approved June 29, 1906, and March 4, 1913, and subsequent acts (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 331-416; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 8, secs. 355-384); including personal services; traveling expenses, and not to exceed \$400 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the naturalization of aliens when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor; street-car fare, telegrams, verifications of legal papers, telephone service in field offices and telephone toll service in the bureau; necessary supplies and equipment for the Naturalization Service; refunding of naturalization fees upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that the collection and deposit was made through error; not to exceed \$25,000 for rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia where suitable quarters can not be obtained in public buildings; and for mileage and fees to witnesses subpoenaed on behalf of the United States, the expenditures from this appropriation to be made in the manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, \$975,770, of which not to exceed \$215,000 may be expended for the salary of the commissioner and other personal services in the bureau in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau," on page 122, line 25, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$395,500" and insert "\$375,500," and on page

123, line 1, before the word "may," to strike out "\$320,760" and insert "\$305,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses of investigating and reporting upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially to investigate the questions of infant mortality; personal services, including experts and temporary assistants; traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings for the promotion of child welfare when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor; purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and for reprints from State, city, and private publications for distribution when said reprints can be procured more cheaply than they can be printed by the Government, and other necessary expenses, \$375,500, of which amount not to exceed \$305,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Women's Bureau," on page 123, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$149,680" and insert "\$134,000," so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the Women's Bureau," approved June 5, 1920 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 11-16; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 29, secs. 12-14), including personal services in the District of Columbia, not to exceed \$134,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask that that amendment be disagreed to. I have an amendment on the desk that I should like to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment proposing to insert "\$134,000," it is proposed to strike out "\$134,000" and insert "\$136,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, let me inquire if the amount by which the appropriation is increased would not have to come out of some other item? I have understood that wherever an increase was made in one item there would have to be a corresponding reduction in some other item.

Mr. JONES. This is merely a limitation.

Mr. BINGHAM. It does not affect the total?

Mr. JONES. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 123, in line 11, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$179,900" and insert "\$160,000," so as to read:

Purchase of material for reports and educational exhibits, and traveling expenses, \$160,000, which sum shall be available for expenses of attendance at meeting concerned with the work of said bureau when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Employment Service," on page 123, line 7, before the word "of," to strike out "\$320,000" and insert "\$720,000," and in line 8, before the word "may," to strike out "\$54,930" and insert "\$48,230," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, including juniors legally employed, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by regularly collecting, furnishing, and publishing employment information as to opportunities for employment; maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States; cooperating with the Veterans' Administration to secure employment for veterans; cooperating with and coordinating the public employment offices throughout the country, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the employment service when specifically authorized by the Secretary of Labor; supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service,

and miscellaneous expenses, \$720,000, of which amount not to exceed \$48,230 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 9, after the name "District of Columbia," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment or maintenance of any employment office unless suitable space therefor can be found in a Federal building or is furnished free of rent by State, county, or local authority, or by individuals or organizations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 14, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any salary in any field employment office at an annual rate in excess of \$2,000, except one director in each State whose salary shall not exceed \$3,000, and 23 managers of the veterans' employment service whose salary shall not exceed \$2,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Housing Corporation," on page 125, line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$14,000," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For officers, clerks, and other employees, and for contingent and miscellaneous expenses, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including blank books, maps, stationery, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, freight and express charges, communication service, travel expense, printing and binding not to exceed \$150, and all other miscellaneous items and expenses not included in the foregoing and necessary to collect and account for the receipts from the sale of properties and the receipts from the operation of unsold properties of the United States Housing Corporation, the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, property commandeered by the United States through the Secretary of Labor, and to collect the amounts advanced to transportation facilities and others; for payment of special assessments and other utility, municipal, State, and county charges or assessments unpaid by purchasers, and which have been assessed against property in which the United States Housing Corporation has an interest, and to defray expenses incident to foreclosing mortgages, conducting sales under deeds of trust, or reacquiring title or possession of real property under default proceeding, including attorney fees, witness fees, court costs, charges, and other miscellaneous expenses; for the maintenance and repair of houses, buildings, and improvements which are unsold; in all, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for the United States Housing Corporation, on page 125, line 22, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$4,900" and insert "\$4,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$4,000 per annum, and only one person may be employed at that rate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. No appropriation under the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, and the judiciary, available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act (1) to increase the compensation of any position within the grade to which such position has been allocated under the classification act of 1923, as amended, (2) to increase the compensation of any position in the field service the pay of which is adjustable to correspond so far as may be practicable to the rates established by such act as amended for the departmental service in the District of Columbia, (3) to increase the compensation of any position under such act through reallocation, (4) to increase the compensation of any person in any grade under such act through advancement to another position in the same grade or to a position in a higher grade at a rate in excess of the minimum rate of such higher grade unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation, or (5) to increase the compensation of any other position of the Federal Government under such departments and the Judiciary, other than commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and so much of the acts of February 23, 1931 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 22, sec. 3a), and February 21, 1931 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 8, sec. 109), as provides automatic increases of salary, respectively, for Foreign Service officers and immigrant inspectors shall not be operative during the period between the date of the approval of this act and June 30, 1933: *Provided*, That no additional credits for service shall be allowed to any commissioned officer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey for purposes of base or period pay, or for longevity pay before July 1, 1933; any increase of base or period pay for length of service, or longevity pay, which would have been authorized under existing law before that date, shall become effective

July 1, 1933, and not earlier, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act: *Provided further*, That from the date of this act to and including June 30, 1933, payment for personal services made in accordance herewith shall constitute payment in full for such services. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of the amounts so impounded for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 22, to strike out:

SEC. 3. No appropriation under the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, and the judiciary available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act to pay the compensation of an incumbent appointed to any position under the Federal Government which is vacant on the date of the approval of this act or to any such position which may become vacant after such date: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply to absolutely essential positions the filling of which may be approved in writing by the President of the United States, or in the case of the positions of officers or employees paid out of the appropriations for the Supreme Court of the United States by the Chief Justice of the United States. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of all such vacancies, the number thereof filled, and the amounts unexpended, for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 3. No appropriation under the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, and the judiciary available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act to pay the compensation of an incumbent appointed to any position under the Federal Government which is vacant on the date of the approval of this act or to any such position which may become vacant after such date: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply (a) to absolutely essential positions the filling of which may be authorized or approved in writing by the President of the United States, either individually or in groups, or (b) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, and co-operative positions. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of all such vacancies, the number thereof filled, and the amounts unexpended, for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session: *Provided*, That such impounding of funds may be waived in writing by the President of the United States in connection with any appropriation or portion of appropriation when, in his judgment, such action is necessary and in the public interest.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to that amendment. There is a provision which we intended to put in with reference to the Supreme Court that was omitted from the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 129, line 4, after the words "United States," it is proposed to insert "or, in the case of the positions of officers or employees paid out of the appropriations for the Supreme Court of the United States, by the Chief Justice of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 129, after line 18, to strike out:

SEC. 4. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for purchasing any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle (except busses, station wagons, and ambulances) at a cost, delivered and completely equipped for operation, in excess of \$750, including the value of a vehicle exchanged where exchange is involved; nor shall any money appropriated herein be used for

maintaining, driving, or operating any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary and then only when the same is approved by the head of the department. This section shall not apply to any motor vehicles for official use of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor.

And insert:

SEC. 4. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for purchasing any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle (except busses, ambulances, and station wagons) at a cost, completely equipped for operation, in excess of \$750, except where, in the judgment of the department, special requirements can not thus be efficiently met, such exceptions, however, to be limited to not to exceed 10 per cent of the total expenditures for such motor vehicles purchased during the fiscal year, including the value of a vehicle exchanged where exchange is involved; nor shall any money appropriated herein be used for maintaining, driving, or operating any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment, except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary, and then only when the same is approved by the head of the department. The limitations of this proviso shall not apply to any motor vehicle for official use of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, line 17, after the word "provision," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to the appropriation for 'Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service,' or to appropriations containing specific rates for subsistence or waivers of the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926 or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. No part of any appropriation made by this act shall be used to pay actual expenses of subsistence in excess of \$6 each for any one calendar day, or per diem allowance for subsistence in excess of the rate of \$5 for any one calendar day, to any officer or employee of the United States, and payments accordingly shall be in full notwithstanding any other statutory provision: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the appropriation for "Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service," or to appropriations containing specific rates for subsistence or waivers of the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926 or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is on its second reading and open to amendment.

Mr. REED. I move the adoption of the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 131, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 6. Not to exceed 12 per cent of any of the foregoing appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other appropriation or appropriations for the fiscal year 1933 under the same department, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 15 per cent by such transfers: *Provided*, That a statement of all transfers of appropriations made hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1935.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have submitted this amendment to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], and to other Senators who have been interested in this matter, and I have the impression that it is satisfactory to all of them. In effect it does not run counter to the action of the Senate in reducing the total appropriation of the bill by 10 per cent. It merely allows transfers between the items of appropriation, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, in the same manner as it is now done and has been done

for years past in the National Guard items of the Army appropriation bill. It recognizes that, with the speed with which the Appropriations Committee has had to work, it could not, in all cases, work out a completely satisfactory result, and, for this one year only, the amendment allows these exchanges to be made between the items of appropriation without increasing the total.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. McKellar. I am wondering what is the meaning of the language in lines 6 and 7 of the amendment, reading as follows:

but no appropriation shall be increased more than 15 per cent by such transfer.

I assume that the Senator means by that that in transferring a maximum of 12 per cent from one appropriation to another the appropriation for that particular item shall not in any case be increased more than 15 per cent?

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. McKellar. I am not sure that that language is sufficiently definite. Will the Senator look at it, and will the chairman of the committee also cast his eye on it?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have examined that amendment, and I think the idea expressed in the amendment is as stated, namely, that a particular appropriation item shall not be increased more than 15 per cent.

Mr. McKellar. Ought there not be the same amount, 12 per cent?

Mr. JONES. I thought so at first, but I came to the other conclusion.

Mr. REED. It will be seen that in dealing with the reduced amount which is to be increased there is a lower base for the calculation of the percentage than on the higher amount which is to be decreased, and I think it comes to about the same result.

Mr. McKellar. I want to say that, of course, I realize this is not good legislation, and ordinarily I would certainly oppose it. I have asked the Senator from Pennsylvania to make it apply on its face only to this year, and that has been done. At this late date there might be some inequalities which we have not ironed out; but the amendment provides that the Budget Director and the department shall furnish the next Congress, or the proper committees of the next Congress, with exact details, and hereafter it will not be necessary, of course, to give this additional authority to the department; but for the first year, in view of the action of the committee and of the Senate in agreeing to these reductions, I am rather inclined to think that a provision of this kind would not be improper provisionally.

Mr. JONES. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Tennessee. I think, under the circumstances, this is a very wise provision, and, of course, it applies, as I understand, only to this bill?

Mr. REED. Only to this bill and only for this year.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. Connally. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, in case of a transfer from a larger sum to a smaller sum, does his percentage apply to both?

Mr. REED. Yes; it applies to both. The smaller sum could not be increased more than 15 per cent.

Mr. Connally. That is the question I wanted to raise. Under the amendment, if there was a large sum in which there could be made a substantial cut, all of it could not be transferred over to a smaller item, could it?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; by no means.

Mr. Connally. To do so would increase the smaller item more than 15 per cent. Now, what I have in mind particularly is this: Under the cut as made here originally the committee took up with the various departments suggestions as to what they would do in the event of these cuts.

In the case of the Bureau of Fisheries, for instance, the department answered back that if we adopted these 10 per cent cuts, they were going absolutely to abandon, I think, about 11 of the Federal fish hatcheries. Some of those hatcheries have been owned by the Government for 30 or

40 years. They own the property, and they have investments. My thought was that if we are going to have elasticity, the matter ought to be sufficiently elastic that the department could not just arbitrarily injure its own service, because to suspend operations entirely in these plants would mean that the property would deteriorate. There ought to be sufficient elasticity so that they could transfer sufficient funds from other appropriations.

In the case of this particular item, suppose the department could properly take an item out of this appropriation and put it in this one, and take another one from that one, and another one from that one, and by trimming a number they could sufficiently build up the appropriation; yet, under the Senator's amendment, no matter how many savings they could accomplish in other places, they could not increase any one item over 15 per cent. That is not elasticity.

Mr. REED. It is only partial elasticity, I confess; but I do not believe we could get Congress to agree to any greater elasticity.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Texas that I am sure that is the case. So far as the particular bureau he has just mentioned is concerned—the Bureau of Fisheries—of course the department, as long as it has the money to conduct a fish hatchery, has no right to discontinue it, because as yet the Congress still controls the question of whether there shall or shall not be a fish hatchery. On the other hand, by this process it is believed that just such a proposal as the Senator has in mind can be effectuated by the department; and there were considerations of this kind that led me to overcome a rather determined opposition to lump-sum appropriations.

I never have believed in lump-sum appropriations. I do not believe in them now. I think it is unwise legislation to make lump-sum appropriations. At the same time, however, in view of the cuts that are made this late in the year, it does seem to me that there ought to be some leeway. I have so expressed myself to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]; and I think, under the circumstances, it ought to be done.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Washington, in charge of this bill, a question in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am in sympathy with the amendment. It is only as to the second section of the amendment that I am raising any question. I agree that there ought to be an elasticity whereby the department could allocate these funds, but I do not want to hamstring the department by saying that no one item can be increased more than 15 per cent.

In the view of the Senator from Washington, would this amendment enable the Department of Commerce, in the allocation of these funds, to correct the situation which I called to the attention of the Senate a moment ago with reference to these fish hatcheries?

Mr. JONES. It would be a great deal better than without this amendment. In view of our reduction of 10 per cent under the orders of the Senate, I think this amendment is a very desirable one. I think it will help very much.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. JONES. It may not meet the whole situation. I doubt if it will. As I remember the language of the amendment, it does not allow us to increase a particular item more than 15 per cent.

Mr. REED. That is right.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that, and that is what I was complaining about.

Mr. JONES. That is better than the limitation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, it is better than nothing, of course.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Now, let me ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. The Senator from Tennessee has been leading the fight for these arbitrary reductions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator does not think they are arbitrary reductions. We make the reductions, not on an arbitrary plan at all but after going over each item and merely reducing the aggregate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume whatever opprobrium goes with that term, because I voted with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have had a whole lot of opprobrium, so I am used to it. Go ahead.

Mr. CONNALLY. I take my share, because I voted with the Senator. Knowing his great anxiety to serve the American people by lessening their burdens at this time, I was glad to support his plan.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it the Senator's view that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will enable the Department of Commerce so to change these figures as to take care of the situation which I mentioned with reference to fish hatcheries?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt whatsoever of it. If I had any doubt about it, I would be perfectly frank to state it to the Senator; but I think it can be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. The point I make is that the department of hatcheries ought not just to abandon properties in which the Government has millions of dollars invested, but rather it ought to lessen its activities at all of these stations, so as to maintain the present organization everywhere. Lessening the activities at all the stations certainly is to be preferred to abandoning plants which in some cases have been under Government control as long as 40 years.

I want to get into the Record the views of Senators, so that the department will know that it is to remedy that sort of a situation that we are adopting the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that I have not a doubt of it. Instead of lessening their activities if they do not have quite so much money to spend, I think it will probably increase their activities and be better for the service. I believe there will be no abandonment of any of the functions of which the Senator has spoken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to say that I do not regard it as any real economy for the Government now to abandon a project temporarily, and then later have to go back and take it up at the expense of much more money than we will save. If, on the other hand, we can take care of the matter by this amendment, I am heartily in favor of it.

Mr. JONES. I want to say that I am in hearty accord with the sentiment expressed by the Senator with reference to the plan that should be followed in connection with these various plants.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is, of slowing down activities everywhere?

Mr. JONES. Yes; slowing them down everywhere, rather than abandoning one entirely.

Mr. CONNALLY. Rather than abandoning one at any particular point?

Mr. JONES. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. And that is the view of the committee?

Mr. JONES. That is my view.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is chairman of the committee. Does he not reflect the views of the committee?

Mr. JONES. That matter was never discussed in the committee, I will say frankly to the Senator; but I agree absolutely with that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion relating to the operation of fish hatcheries under the Bureau of Fisheries, the item is found at page 97 of the bill. It was reduced from \$986,730 to \$886,730, a cut of \$100,000, practically 10 per cent, and accordingly was in harmony with the resolution adopted by the Senate directing the committee to cut the total of the bill 10 per cent under the House figures.

In my own State we have a new hatchery, just being completed, at a cost of about \$50,000. It is almost ready to be placed in operation. I am told by the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries that under this cut as it now stands that hatchery, although it is completed and fully equipped and ready for operation, can not be placed in service for one year, but that with an additional sum of only \$3,000 that hatchery could be placed in operation without delay.

Is it the view of the Senator from Washington, chairman of the committee, that under this amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania funds could be diverted from one branch of a department to another branch of the same department to meet an emergency of that kind?

Mr. JONES. I understand so. I think so. It is thoroughly interchangeable.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I favor the principle involved in the amendment. We are making drastic cuts. I favor making them. Conditions require us to make them. I believe that a provision of this kind would soften the shock and would permit a department to meet the emergencies with less disturbance.

I hope very much that the amendment will be adopted; and I hope, too, that before Congress adjourns we will pass a joint resolution to accord the same privilege to the Department of the Interior. The appropriation bill for that department has passed and been approved and is now a law. It does not contain any such provision as this. I think we should pass a joint resolution giving that department the same privileges that is embodied in the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I hope this amendment will be adopted. None of us wants to make the administration of a department too inconvenient or too difficult.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be all right if the provision were made applicable only to appropriations made this year for the ensuing year, just as is provided here.

Mr. BRATTON. Oh, certainly. I think the privilege should be confined to the particular appropriation bills we are now passing for the next fiscal year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. COSTIGAN and Mr. TRAMMELL addressed the Chair. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I move a reconsideration of the amendment. The Chair disregarded at least two Senators who were addressing the Chair for the purpose of having something to say, and proceeded with the vote. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote will be reconsidered. Meantime, the Chair has recognized the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN].

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, confirming what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] has stated, I hold in my hand responsible protests from Colorado citizens and certain branches of the Izaak Walton League of America, indicating that the appropriation, in the form in which it was reported by the Senate committee, will result in closing important and desirable fish hatcheries in the State of Colorado. I hope, therefore, that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] will be adopted and that the interpretation given to it by the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge, will have the effect of keeping those and similar hatcheries open.

AMERICAN WOMEN AND THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU

While speaking, Mr. President, I desire to add that the Senate has to-day acted on an appropriation for the Children's Bureau, just 20 years after that bureau was created and within the shadows of the lamented death at Rockford, Ill., of our eminent countrywoman, Miss Julia C. Lathrop, who was the first chief of that bureau. It is trebly appropriate to pause to have placed in the RECORD an article on the purposes and work of the Children's Bureau in the last two decades, prepared by Miss Grace Abbott, another of America's most distinguished women.

Miss Abbott succeeded Miss Lathrop as chief of the Children's Bureau in 1921. Her public services, like those of Miss Lathrop and of their brilliant recently deceased coworker, Mrs. Florence Kelley, are rooted in the fine traditions of Hull House, Chicago, over which presides Miss

Jane Addams, another American woman of world-wide fame. The bureau is, therefore, a living monument to the public devotion and leadership of noble American womanhood. Miss Abbott's admirable mind, heart, and trained efficiency have won respect and honor, here and abroad, for her and for the humane and humanizing governmental activities she directs.

I trust, Mr. President, that unanimous consent will be given to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article by Miss Abbott, which was published in the New York Times of April 10, 1932.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VICTORIES FOR CHILD WELFARE WON IN THE LAST TWO DECADES—DELINQUENCY, EXPLOITATION, AND DEATH RATIOS LOWERED AND HOME RESTORED TO IMPORTANCE SINCE CHILDREN'S BUREAU STARTED

By Grace Abbott

On April 9, 1912, the bill creating the United States Children's Bureau was signed by President Taft. It had been proposed by the first White House Conference on Child Welfare, and President Roosevelt in his message to Congress recommending its passage shortly after the conference said:

"It is not only discreditable to us as a people that there is now no recognized and authoritative source of information upon these subjects relating to child life but in the absence of such information as should be supplied by the Federal Government many abuses have gone unchecked; for public sentiment, with its great corrective power, can only be aroused by full knowledge of the facts."

Three years after this appeal to Congress by President Roosevelt and after President Taft had also recommended its passage, the Children's Bureau, with Julia C. Lathrop as the first chief, began to function as a national center of information, of research and education as to the needs of the whole child and the interrelated problems of health, dependency, delinquency, and the employment of children. The task which was assigned to the Children's Bureau by Congress 20 years ago is not completed. It meets the proverbial description of women's work—it is never done.

There have, however, been important accomplishments in these two decades, of which the following are examples:

In 1912 the birth-registration area had not been established, and facts about even so important a subject as the number of babies that were born or died each year were not available.

In 1932 the United States birth-registration area comprises 46 States and the District of Columbia.

INFANT MORTALITY DECREASED

In 1912 it was estimated that 300,000 babies died during the first year of life. In 1930, in spite of a large increase in population, it was estimated that about 150,000 died. The mother of the 1912 baby was, as a rule, less well prepared to care for him and expert assistance was much more generally available for the 1932 baby. Because his mother knows more about the value of sunlight, of cod-liver oil, and the importance of milk and fruit and vegetables, the child of to-day is much less apt to have rickets and is more frequently a healthy, well-developed child. The 1932 child is much less apt to die of diphtheria and scarlet fever than the 1912 child.

In 1912 there were some 2,000,000 children over 10 and under 16 years of age employed in gainful occupations in the United States (according to the 1910 census, 1,990,225). Complete figures for 1930 are not yet available, but in 44 States and the District of Columbia 609,729 children of these ages were employed. This decrease can not all be considered a permanent gain, however, because unemployment conditions in 1930 affected children as well as adults.

In 1912 only two States had mothers' pensions laws. Now 45 States and the District of Columbia have such laws. In 1912 in a large number of communities delinquent children were tried, convicted, and punished under our criminal laws. Now all but two States have juvenile court laws and 13 have family courts, and organized juvenile court and probation service has been extended from the large cities, where it first originated, to many small towns and rural communities.

In 1912 only one State had a bureau of child health; to-day 47 States have such bureaus. Only one State then had created a bureau of child welfare to promote the interest of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children. To-day more than half the States have such bureaus or divisions of State welfare departments. In 1912 the movement for country-wide health and social services had not been initiated. To-day approximately one-sixth of the counties have adopted organized county plans for health or social service or both.

In 1912 only one State had a State commission for the study of child welfare legislation; since 1912 more than half the States have created child welfare commissions to consider the needs of children, and State legislation relating to children has been coordinated and modernized.

RELATIVE PROGRESS

Progress is, after all, relative. We want to know not only how far the United States has gone in safeguarding childhood but how our

gains compare with those of other countries. The general trend of the infant death rate has been downward. It is estimated that in 1912 out of every 1,000 babies born alive 124 died during the first year of life; in 1920 the death rate was 86, and in 1930, 64 in the United States birth-registration area. This is very encouraging until one compares these rates with the rates for New Zealand. In that little island 68 babies out of every 1,000 born alive died in 1910, 51 in 1920, and 34 in 1930. The New Zealand rate in 1930 was lower than the lowest rate for any State. It was 47 per cent lower than the rate for the United States birth-registration area. The irreducible minimum for the United States has not been reached when the death rate in New Zealand is 47 per cent lower than in our own country.

The experience of the United States and of other countries with both higher and lower death rates among babies is that while new scientific discoveries have contributed to the great saving of infant life in the last 20 years, the most important factor has been that the parents of 1932 know more about the scientific care of children than did those of 1912, and they are using more intelligently the knowledge and skill of the physician.

PARENTS AND CHILD CARE

Parents of to-day know more because they are given more and better opportunities to learn the best methods of child care. Less expensive and more practical books giving the general principles of child care are now available and widely used. Free distribution of Government publications is traditional in the United States, but the appropriation of the Children's Bureau has never enabled it to meet the demand for its popular bulletins.

The Superintendent of Documents reports that from the date of their publication to 1932 nearly 2,000,000 of these bulletins have been sold and more than 10,000,000 distributed free.

While child specialists a generation ago were usually called only to care for sick children, to-day many of them are devoting as much as a third of their time to the supervision of well children. The great teaching agency is the child-health center. First started by infant-welfare societies in the larger urban centers, their number has greatly increased in recent years. Centers have been established in many small towns and rural communities with the assistance of the State governments and of the Federal Government from 1921 to 1929. But hardly more than a beginning has been made in making these agencies for parental education available to all mothers.

The change in the community and the parental attitude toward the conduct problems of children is even more marked. The juvenile-court movement was well under way at the beginning of the period which we are reviewing. Both the old conceptions of punishment as a preventive and of "justice" as equality of treatment have died slowly. Under the new legal theory of the juvenile court children are all treated alike only when they are all treated differently. The question is not what should be done for particular types of offenses, but what should be done for individual children. The objective is cure, not punishment.

This is, however, a much more difficult theory to administer. Moreover, if the objective is cure, not punishment, we must make sure that the cure is successful. The attempt to prevent or cure delinquency among children has led to study of physical and mental defects of children, to investigation of their mental and personality problems, to examination of their environments for causes of maladjustment, and to experiment in individual or group training during the preschool period. The first psychiatric clinic for the study of child delinquency, established largely through the efforts of Julia Lathrop, was still regarded as experimental in 1912. There are more than 600 psychiatric and child guidance clinics at the present time.

A review of the research of the last 20 years reveals the abandonment of one "cause" after another which was for a time believed to explain the delinquency of children. We have the beginnings of a new technique.

But if the objective is a scientific approach to the conduct problems of the individual child, necessary resources are still lacking for the study and treatment of the great majority of children who pass through our courts and are committed to correctional institutions. Probation officers, physicians, and psychiatrists attached to juvenile courts, child-guidance clinics, visiting teachers, special schools for truants, and classes in child training for parents are all a result of the effort to cure or to prevent delinquency. Information based on annual reports of the courts is available for 13 cities for the years 1915 to 1927, or for a considerable part of that period. In 10 of these 13 cities the delinquency ratio was lower for the last year reported, and in all but 3 of the 10 the decline was significant.

HOMES KEPT INTACT

In spite of all the criticism that has been leveled at the modern home, its importance in the life of the child is more generally accepted in social treatment to-day than 20 years ago and much more generally than a hundred years ago. On the theory that intelligent and affectionate care of children by their own parents is the greatest safeguard of the future welfare of children, every effort is now being made by the best social agencies to preserve the child's home. The "mothers' pension" laws and the great extension of "home relief" and "family-welfare work" have that objective.

As a result of years of practice in the treatment of dependency there is general agreement among social workers to-day that no child should be removed from his own home or from the cus-

tody of his own parents or parent because of poverty or illegitimacy alone. This apparently elementary policy has, in fact, worked a revolution in the social treatment of dependency. Money formerly available to care for children only away from their homes is now used to keep the homes intact.

The most significant change is in the number of dependent children who are now cared for in their own homes. Legislation providing for "mothers' pensions" or "allowances" or "assistance to parents' funds," first enacted in Illinois and Missouri in 1911, has now been enacted in 45 States and in the District of Columbia. In the States enacting such legislation there has also been a steady growth in the total number of families aided, in the amount expended, and in the number of counties giving this type of assistance.

For example, in Wisconsin in 1913 aid was given to 187 families, and \$9,632 was expended in keeping children with their mothers; by 1928, 6,274 families were being assisted and the cost was \$1,533,900. Whereas in 1913 in Wisconsin only 5 counties had taken advantage of the permissive mothers' pension law, in 1928 all the counties (71) were using this method of care.

Wisconsin reflects rural conditions. The urban tendency is even more marked. In New York City the mothers' aid expenditures have increased constantly since 1916, the first year the act was in operation. The \$165,000 expended that first year had grown to \$6,479,000 in 1929. It should, however, be noted that while the general trend is to safeguard the family unit, the progress is not always constant. At this moment the case-working standards of the family-welfare agencies in many cities are practically suspended because of the widespread unemployment and the consequent emergency relief. Homes are being broken up that in other circumstances would be preserved.

EXPLOITATION REDUCED

The struggle to protect children from industrial exploitation began more than a hundred years ago. In each generation opponents have replied to the demand for legal protection that children are a part of the necessary labor supply. Although it is now generally agreed that a full utilization of our capital and adult labor resources produce more than we can at present consume, nearly 2,000,000 children and young persons under 18 years of age were employed in 1930. During that year, in spite of the unprecedented number of unemployed men and women, it is estimated that some 180,000 boys and girls under 16 left school for work.

Great progress has been made in the century and in the last 20 years in reducing the number of child workers by legal enactment and by a change in public opinion. The Child Welfare Conference in 1919 recommended 16 as the minimum school-leaving age. That is the proposal of the White House Conference of 1930. Some 43 States now require that children attend school until they are at least 16 years of age, though many of the laws contain certain exemptions and all except two authorize their release for employment at a specified age below 16 if they have reached certain minimum standards of education and physical fitness, sometimes with the additional requirement that economic necessity must be shown.

A study of the trends of the last 20 years makes clear that a great change is developing in our conceptions of the part our State governments must play in promoting the welfare of children. Prevention is now the keynote in all our social services. Institutional care, for so long the only rôle of the State, is no longer adequate. For a program of prevention a close working relationship between the State agencies and the local community is necessary. The State departments of health and welfare are now assuming a rôle of leadership in establishing well-organized local services.

ENEMIES OF CHILDHOOD

At the present time, however, many of the gains of the past 20 years are threatened. Unemployment and low wages are enemies of childhood. As Julia Lathrop said:

"Children are not safe and happy if their parents are miserable, and parents must be miserable if they can not protect a home against poverty. Let us not deceive ourselves—the power to maintain a decent family living standard is the primary essential of child welfare."

In his opening address to the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection in the autumn of 1930 President Hoover called attention to the estimate of one of the conference committees that there were 6,000,000 improperly nourished children in the United States. That number has increased by leaps and bounds during the last three years. Security in the home is essential for a happy childhood. Security has gone from homes of the millions of unemployed and fear of economic disaster has destroyed it for many others.

The number of children in institutions for dependent children has increased. Adequate budgets for children's agencies are becoming increasingly difficult to secure. But those who have been given community responsibility for the care of children are determined that hard-won gains shall not be lost. State and local White House conferences are charting the needs of children and making plans for future improvement.

The real basis for hope for greater progress in safeguarding the health and general welfare of the children of the United States lies in a growing knowledge of the widespread preventable suffering among children. The peculiar hardships of these last years may quicken our sensitiveness to such suffering and lead to more effective conservation of our greatest national asset.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to ask the author of the amendment as to its application to items that constitute a general appropriation.

The amendment provides that not exceeding 12 per cent may be transferred. I will illustrate. We have a gross appropriation of \$2,000,000 for certain given purposes. Under this provision authorizing a transfer of 12 per cent, should the department, in the exercise of that privilege, be allowed to go in and entirely destroy some activity or some project that has been estimated for as a basis for the appropriation? That is the point that occurs to me—that the department might entirely wipe out some enterprise or some project which Congress had intended should be continued.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, at the very most they could reduce only 12 per cent.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I know; but they could reduce 12 per cent of the appropriation. We have in the bill here what we might call an omnibus appropriation of \$2,000,000 for certain purposes. Within that are items numbering probably a hundred or two hundred, which were estimated for.

Mr. REED. Where does the Senator find that total?

Mr. TRAMMELL. The Senator will find quite a good many such items. I do not recall, just for the moment, the one to which I was referring. I saw one a few moments ago amounting to \$2,000,000, but I do not remember what page it was on. I find one here for the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. REED. What page?

Mr. TRAMMELL. On page 86, a total of \$2,137,280. I merely turned to that in the bill. What if they decided that they wanted to do away with some activity? I am not thinking of the Bureau of Standards in particular, but that will illustrate. Suppose they want to do away with some activity of the Bureau of Standards entirely. They could, by just one brush of the pen, under this 12 per cent provision, do away with that activity, and that would constitute 12 per cent of the entire appropriation.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; and I am glad the Senator has pointed out that illustration. The figure to which he calls attention is merely the total of the figures occurring in items which stretch over several pages of the bill. It would be impossible, for example, to abolish the hydraulic laboratory research work, which we find provided for at the top of page 85. The appropriation for that is \$40,000. That item could not be obliterated. It could be reduced only 12 per cent.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think it is a very good idea, of course, to authorize this latitude; and it is probably necessary, making such a sweeping change as we have made; but I did not want the Senate to adopt some amendment which might result in the abandonment of some enterprise which Congress had authorized and which we had had an estimate for and which we do not desire to have discontinued.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator's point is very well taken.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is the point, and I want that to be pretty well understood in the Record. I call the attention of the Senator to the item of light vessels on page 89, "For salaries and wages of officers and crews of light vessels and lighthouse tenders, including temporary employment when necessary, \$2,370,000."

What if, under the exercise of the 12 per cent provision, the Lighthouse Bureau, under the Department of Commerce, should say, "We are going to discontinue certain lights." That is the point I want to guard against.

Mr. REED. Of course I think we could safely depend upon it that the necessary lighthouses are not going to be discontinued. I think there is much more chance that that item will be added to, in order to continue in service a lighthouse, than that it will be reduced.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I just wanted to make it plain that we would not want the department to impair some very necessary service which Congress had contemplated having continued.

In my State I think the alarm is unnecessary, but I have had a good many telegrams and letters to the effect that the word had gone out that they were going to discontinue all the beacon lights on the St. Johns River, which is a navi-

gable waterway extending a long distance, which has been in use for years and years, and is quite an important transportation route.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the adoption of this amendment would certainly add very much to his chances of getting what he desires for his State.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I thank the Senator. It is not a matter of getting anything; it is a matter of maintaining a system of beacon lights which has been in existence for perhaps a half a century or a century, and it would be absolutely destructive to the navigation on that river, for a distance of some 150 or 200 miles, if the department were, under some plan of economy, to discontinue the use of those beacon lights on the St. Johns River. I have had this matter up with the Lighthouse Bureau, and they have assured me that they do not know of anything of the kind in contemplation. I do not know how the alarm got abroad, but a great many people seem to think that there is cause for alarm.

Mr. McKELLAR. It got abroad just as many of the other alarms got abroad; the Cabinet officers are sending out the alarms.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I have wanted the matter understood. Of course, I would not want to support some amendment which would result in doing away with a very useful system of lighting such as we have on the St. Johns River. I appreciate, however, the necessity of giving the department some latitude in connection with handling the administration of these appropriations as we have reduced them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is not more interested in the maintenance of these lighthouses than are all of us on the Gulf. But, as he says, the service has assured him that it has no purpose of abolishing or lessening that service. Is that correct?

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is what they told me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the Senator to say that. I want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, the author of the amendment, if it is his view that his amendment will operate to give the Department of Commerce the power to continue these fish hatcheries which have been referred to, as was disclosed in the debate a moment ago?

Mr. REED. Yes, Mr. President; it is my hope and my belief that it will give them just that power.

Mr. CONNALLY. That, along with other things, was the purpose of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. REED. I make the same answer to the Senator that the Senator from Tennessee made with regard to the lighthouses. I think the adoption of the amendment is calculated to assure the maintenance of these important activities, far more than it jeopardizes them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to have that from the author of the amendment as evidencing the legislative intent.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in this matter, as the Senator from Texas is, and have enjoyed the discussion very much. But I do not think I thoroughly agree that this will have a tendency to prevent the closing down of hatcheries. It might be almost as unfortunate if it resulted in closing them down six months or nine months, as if it resulted in closing them for 12 months in the year. Certainly we can not object to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, because it will be helpful to whatever extent it goes. But the Senator from Tennessee assures me that he has no desire to shut down these hatcheries, where it will take only four or five thousand dollars a year to operate them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORBECK. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from South Dakota should not express any fear about it, because it has been developed here in the debate that one of the very purposes of offering this amendment is to maintain these hatcheries.

Mr. NORBECK. Yes; but it has not developed that it will maintain them.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the department does not respect the will and the wishes of the Congress, we will know the reason why.

Mr. NORBECK. I am getting to the point, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not cast any suggestion into the mind of the Department of Commerce that we do not mean exactly what we have been saying we do mean.

Mr. NORBECK. I realize that the Department of Commerce is limited by the provision of the amendment itself to 12 per cent. I want to go farther and suggest that the Senate ought to know, by the time the deficiency bills come before us, whether or not the department is able to keep these hatcheries going, so that we would have opportunity to take care of the item in the deficiency bill. I would like to have the view of the Senator from Tennessee in regard to that matter. Does the Senator think it could be done?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I said before, I take it that there will be ample money to do what has been spoken of here. I have no doubt about it in my own mind at all, and if that money should not be sufficient, of course any Senator will have the right to come before the Committee on Appropriations when we are considering a deficiency bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that when the deficiency bills come in, if it is then apparent that the Bureau of Fisheries has paid no attention to the expressed will of the Congress with reference to this item, it would then be very appropriate to handle the matter by trimming some of the salaries of those who have not respected our wishes.

Mr. NORBECK. Certainly. If we find that under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania they are not able to keep the fish hatcheries going, we must take up the question of fish hatcheries when a deficiency bill comes before us.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I want to say, in behalf of the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries, that I talked with him at some length about this matter. He assumed a very fair and a very reasonable attitude about it. I do not believe Commissioner O'Malley has any purpose or any desire to harm the system. Quite the contrary. I think he will cooperate to the fullest in administering the system in the very best way he can under the limitations imposed by this bill. We are cutting the appropriation, we are doing it deliberately, and I am in full sympathy with that. I supported the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to recommit the bill with instructions to the Committee on Appropriations to reduce the appropriations 10 per cent, and I expect to adhere to that action in connection with subsequent appropriation bills, unless it be with regard to certain items in the Army and Navy measures.

I believe that the Commissioner of Fisheries will do the very best possible under the cuts we are now imposing upon this bureau. I believe that with the latitude conferred by the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Bureau of Fisheries will find a way to continue operating the hatcheries now in the service, and will put into the service the new ones which have been completed and are now ready to be placed in service. I shall insist that the one in my State be placed in service without delay. It must be done. This amendment provides a method to do so.

I do not want the impression to go abroad that we believe the commissioner, out of any spirit of antagonism or lack of cooperation, will willfully injure the system. I think just the opposite. That should be stated, in fairness to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the item on page 96. The estimate is decreased only \$45,000, and it would be the easiest thing in the world, under the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, to arrange the matter.

Mr. BRATTON. The item to which I call the Senate's attention is at the top of page 97, which reflects a cut of \$100,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Comparatively that is a very small cut, and it could easily be supplied, if the department so willed, to take care of the item in question.

Mr. BRATTON. It can be easily supplied, and I think it will be readily done. That is why I give my support to the amendment, believing that it can be done, and that the commissioner will do it. I have confidence in his judgment and in his good purpose to cooperate with Congress in meeting the situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Ohio proposes to insert at the proper place the following:

For the purpose of defraying the expenses of participation by the United States Government in the Second Polar Year Program, August 1, 1932, to August 31, 1933, \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, contingent expenses, official cards, printing and binding, purchase of necessary books, documents, and periodicals, camp and field supplies, scientific instruments and equipment, construction of necessary temporary buildings for housing equipment and for observations, hire, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying motor vehicles, transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), stenographic and other services, and purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and such other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of State in furtherance of the project described; and the Secretary of State may transfer this fund, or so much as may be deemed necessary, to the Department of Commerce, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, for direct expenditure by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I crave the attention of every Senator on the floor of the Senate at this moment.

Congress authorized an appropriation of \$30,000 for the second polar program. The only one we have had heretofore was 1882. We hope to have the one in 1932, and then there will not be another for 50 years. If we do not participate in this one, then the United States will not have participated in this service for 100 years.

In 1882 the representatives of a group of nations, 26 in number, in the interest of meteorological situations affecting shipping and other activities, met and outlined the first polar program which sent out 14 different expeditions, 12 into the Arctic and 2 into the Antarctic region. The results of the expeditions are well understood. They are altogether scientific and of tremendous value.

In 1929 the representatives of 34 nations met in what is known as the International Meteorological Conference at Copenhagen. They discussed the feasibility of a second polar program. It was unanimously recommended that it be put in operation. The United States decided that it could not afford to stay out of the program. We thought in view of the meteorological, auroral, electric, and other phenomena of the air and sea, the programs which are put on in the interest of all the nations using shipping on the seas ought to have the support of this Nation. A resolution was introduced and adopted without opposition in the House, came over to the Senate and was approved unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was thought to be a proper procedure and we passed it in the Senate with no opposition, granting the authorization recommended by the Geodetic Survey, which stated that it is extremely important and that this Nation ought to be connected with the effort. I assumed the Appropriations Committee overlooked it because some one has failed to call it to their attention. Upon making some investigation I found that it had been presented to the committee. I do not understand on what basis the authorization for \$30,000

for this work is ignored by the Committee on Appropriations. It means that in their judgment this is not an important service.

Let me read a brief statement:

In the First International Polar Year Program, from August, 1882, to August, 1883, 14 expeditions were sent to the field, 12 in the Arctic and 2 in the Antarctic, by 12 different countries, fully equipped for comprehensive meteorological observations. The United States took part in this program, establishing stations at Point Barrow, Alaska, and Fort Conger (Lady Franklin Bay), Ellesmere Island.

The International Meteorological Conference held at Copenhagen in September, 1929, with representatives from 34 countries present, proposed a Second International Polar Year Program, which found stimulus in the many new problems that have arisen during the past 50 years requiring additional data for their solution. During the second polar year period, August 1, 1932, to August 31, 1933, it is intended that a number of observation stations in the Arctic and Antarctic regions will be operated for observing and recording magnetic, electric, auroral, and meteorological phenomena during that period according to an internationally concerted schedule. The United States will establish a station near Fairbanks, Alaska, a point accessible at all times of the year by steamer and railway. Twenty-six of the countries represented at the international meteorological organization have made favorable replies regarding the proposed program.

I scarcely think it credible that the Members of the Senate look upon this enterprise as of so little value that they will say the United States shall not participate in the program. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has just suggested to me sotto voce that no one will oppose it. The fact is it has been left out of the report of the Committee on Appropriations. I am of the opinion that no one can afford to oppose it, but I am wondering just what it means. I offer the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee did not overlook the matter. It was given very careful attention in the committee under the conditions which confront us to-day. The subcommittee, I may say, recommended \$20,000 for the purpose; but, when it came to the full committee, the item was stricken out altogether before there was any order made by the Senate with reference to a 10 per cent cut. After the Senate made its order that we must cut 10 per cent below the House figures, of course, we could not put the item back in the bill.

If the Senate should vote this \$30,000, it would mean about \$27,000 or \$28,000 above the amount we were permitted to report under the 10 per cent cut order of the Senate. In other words, the bill now carries about \$1,400 less than the limit allowed by the 10 per cent cut. If the Senate sees fit to add this item to the bill, it will carry it \$27,000 or \$28,000 above its 10 per cent cut order to the committee.

As I said, the subcommittee recommended \$20,000; but the full committee, before the Senate gave the order to cut 10 per cent, struck out the item entirely. There is no good that has come to us from the observations of 50 years ago, and there will be none coming from another observation, in my opinion.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, does the Senator say no good has come out of it?

Mr. JONES. There has been no particular good pointed out and no substantial benefit indicated.

Mr. FESS. I should like to submit to the Senator himself a report which was made on the first polar program and he certainly will not say then that no good has come out of it.

Mr. JONES. I have not any doubt about the scientific reports that would probably be made to scientists, and so forth, but I have not seen any indication of any particular good that can be traced back to the observation of 50 years ago.

Mr. FESS. Let me ask the Senator a question. I recognize the stress under which the Senator is operating. He can not make me believe that he thinks there is no value coming out of this work. I recognize why he is taking the position he does, and I can not criticize him for it; but I would like to keep the way open so that the conferees at least can provide for this second polar program.

Mr. JONES. Let me suggest to the Senator that some item covering the matter could be put in the deficiency

appropriation bill, which will be acted upon, of course, before the session is over. To add \$30,000 to the bill by this item is for the Senate to act directly contrary to the orders which it gave the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FESS. What position would the Senate be in if I asked for an amendment to the amount, recognizing that it is not enough and would amount to nothing? It would leave open the way for the conference to take care of the matter.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will amend his amendment by making it \$1,000, it would be within the 10 per cent cut ordered heretofore by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will take that course, or wait until the deficiency appropriation bill comes in, then the matter may be taken care of. I hope he will not upset the plan of the Senate. I have sympathy with the proposal of the Senator from Ohio. The Committee on Appropriations turned down the item long before the bill was recommitted; and yet, as I said to the Senator, I have some sympathy with the proposal. I would like to look into it more carefully, and I hope the Senator will take the course which has been suggested by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FESS. The only difficulty would be that it would appear that the judgment of the Senator from Ohio might be that \$1,000 would be sufficient to do the work, and that would be an outrageous suggestion.

Mr. JONES. It is perfectly clear that \$1,000 is not enough to do the work if it is going to be done at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that under the peculiar circumstances that is the course for the Senator from Ohio to take. We are in a bad situation. Let us not complicate it further, but let us see what we can do.

Mr. FESS. My opinion is that it would be very bad psychology for me to do that, and I am willing to let my amendment come to a vote.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I have the greatest sympathy for what the Senator from Ohio is seeking to do, and I shall vote for the amendment he has offered; but I do think that the reflections which he made upon the Appropriations Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, were not justified.

I would like for the sake of the RECORD to call attention to the fact that a number of very important things have been entirely left out of this bill. For instance, an item for the next Pan American conference, which is to be held at Montevideo, Uruguay, and which will be attended by all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, for which an appropriation of \$80,000 was provided by the House, has been entirely left out of the bill. It was not the intention of the committee that this action should be any reflection upon that conference or upon the importance of "getting together" with our neighbors on the south. It was merely thought that in these days and under the order of the Senate they ought to cut out the item.

Another very serious cut has been made in connection with the airways. The lighted airways, under the bill as reported by the committee, will have to be reduced. The remark has been made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] about beacons on the St. Johns River being possibly cut out. I hope under the amendment to which we just agreed, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], that will be avoided. But under the provisions of the bill as it has been reported nearly 2,000 miles of lighted airways will have to be put out of commission because money is not provided for their maintenance. A number of radio operators giving weather reports to aviators as they fly will lose their jobs and their offices will be closed. Lights along about 1,700 miles of airways can no longer be maintained under the bill. It is a very serious situation. It means that pilots flying the mail over these airways will either have to risk their lives by flying in the dark or have to cease operations entirely. That is the kind of thing that has been done in the reporting of the bill. Therefore it does not seem to me the Senator from Ohio is quite fair in the reflections which he made upon the committee.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. FESS. If any suggestion I made was unfair, I withdraw it. What I was concerned about was that I supposed no one had appeared before the committee in connection with the matter; and although an authorization had been granted, the item was omitted anyway. That was the understanding under which I was laboring.

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall be glad to vote for the Senator's amendment, and I only wish we might have had some money for the Pan American conference, but both items were stricken out entirely.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there may be some difference of opinion about it, but in my judgment every item cut out of the bill after the 10 per cent order was made was more important even than this one. The question is whether or not we are going to restore this one item and leave all the other items out of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I call for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that a few days ago I gave notice of my intention to submit a motion to suspend the rule for the purpose of offering an amendment for the consolidation of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico, with the American section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the American section, International Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby consolidated with the American section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. Hereafter the powers, duties, and functions of such section of such commission shall be exercised by the American section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

All records, files, and property of any nature whatsoever (including office equipment) of, and that portion of the unexpended appropriations less \$25,000 for the American section of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico, for the fiscal year 1931-32, are transferred to the American section, International Boundary Commission, and said appropriations shall be immediately available for direct expenditure by the American section, International Boundary Commission, under the direction of the commissioner thereof, and shall continue to be so available until June 30, 1933. The commissioner is authorized to appoint to positions in the American section, International Boundary Commission, such employees of the American section, International Water Commission, or other persons as he may deem necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act, and said commissioner is further authorized to designate and redesignate, as he may determine to be necessary, the duties and headquarters station of all employees under his supervision.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the amendment, of course, is subject to a point of order. For that reason, as I understand, the Senator, as he has stated, gave notice that he would move to-day, or when the proper time came, to suspend the rule in order that he might offer the amendment. I myself am perfectly satisfied with the amendment. It will work along economical lines.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What would the saving be?

Mr. JONES. I do not remember the exact amount, but the adoption of the amendment will result in an economy; it will save some money; and I am perfectly willing for the Senator from Texas to make his motion to suspend the rule, pursuant to the notice given by him, and I am perfectly willing to have the vote taken on that motion without any roll call. Then, if the rule shall be suspended, he may offer his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move to suspend the rule in order that I may offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No point of order has been made as yet against the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that what the Senator from Texas desires may be done, I make the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I made the motion at the suggestion of the Senator from Washington, who wants to save his face on points of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that there may not be any doubt about it, I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CONNALLY. I now move to suspend the rule pursuant to the notice which I gave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice submitted by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the notice to suspend the rule submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on the 22d instant.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the notice is the regular form provided for the purpose, and I suggest that the reading of it be waived.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let it be put in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice will be printed in the RECORD.

The notice referred to is as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to suspend paragraph 4 of Rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz, on page 16, after line 12, insert the following—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been read.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to debate the amendment, but several Senators desire me to explain it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest that the question on suspending the rules may be put, and then the amendment may be debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas to suspend the rules in order that the amendment may be offered. [Putting the question.]

There being no adverse vote, more than two-thirds of the Senate voting in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to, and the rule is suspended.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Texas now explain his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators that we now have two international commissions that deal with matters between the United States and Mexico. One of them is the American section of the United States-Mexican Boundary Commission and the other is the International Water Commission. At present the same man represents the United States on both commissions; he is American boundary commissioner and also American water commissioner. The purpose of this amendment is to consolidate his forces into one office. It will save the Government money; it will eliminate some of the machinery. I can not tell the Senate just how much it will save, but there is a limitation in line 3, page 2, which provides a saving of \$25,000. In other words, the pending bill makes available all the unexpended balance; this amendment makes available all the unexpended balance less \$25,000. So the amendment, if adopted, will save the Government at least \$25,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is the salary of the commissioner an annual salary for each position or is he paid on a per diem basis?

Mr. CONNALLY. He draws only one salary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. For both positions?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; for both positions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But it will result in the saving of some money?

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, it will save at least \$25,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask for the adoption of an amendment which does not call for an additional appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

ONE THOUSANDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL PARLIAMENT OF ICELAND

The unexpended balance of \$3,173.75 of the appropriation of \$55,000 contained in the joint resolution approved January 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 57), for the expenses of participation by the United States in the celebration of the one thousandth anniversary of the Althing, the National Parliament of Iceland, is continued available until June 30, 1933, for the same purposes, and for the transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926 or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto) of a representative or representatives of the Government of the United States to make the formal presentation of the statue of Leif Ericsson, including such expenses of entertainment as the Secretary of State shall deem proper.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is an unexpended balance of about \$3,000 available, which, under the amendment, is continued. The amendment does not increase the amount appropriated in the bill, and so I do not have any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be an amendment before us which may be debated, I move, on page 63, line 17, to strike out "\$670,000" and insert "\$725,000."

Mr. JONES. I make the point of order against the amendment that the committee amendment at that point has already been agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want it understood by all Senators that when we talk here about the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], and of which I heartily approve, and think we are going to find money in this already emasculated bill to establish fish-cultural stations and other activities, there will be cruel awakenings. It is all right to have the Record show that the appeal was made and the hope expressed that such things might be accomplished, but, of course, they will not be, because there is not money enough in the bill to take care of all these activities, no matter how desirable.

As is well understood, I am here to say one further and probably the last word about the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. This morning I received a telegram from Buffalo. That city is interested in this matter, because if this bill shall pass as it is now before us, the office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce there, as well as offices in 18 other places in this country, will be abolished; they will no longer exist.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will state to the Senator that I have received similar protests from my State against the possible abolition of some of these offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for the confirmation of my fear. The telegram to which I refer is from the president of the Buffalo Exporters' Association, and no doubt it accords with similar telegrams received by the Senator from Massachusetts. It reads:

BUFFALO, N. Y., April 29, 1932.

HON. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your effort opposing discontinuance Buffalo district office Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Our organization, which consists leading exporters of Buffalo, urge you and

associates continue efforts. Local office performs indispensable service required by large and small firms alike throughout western New York. Removal of services now would seriously retard rapidly growing export trade from this area.

E. A. FORSYTHE,
President Buffalo Exporters' Association.

Mr. President, I have not before me at the moment the list which was presented here the other day by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] covering 18 or 20 offices in different parts of the country that will be closed if this bill shall become a law as it now stands in the text before us to-day.

Let me call attention to what is going to happen if the Treasury and Post Office bill should pass as it will have to be written under similar instructions given by the Senate to the committee. It will abolish customs offices in Indiana, Iowa, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Kentucky, Tennessee, Nebraska, Missouri, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, California, Rhode Island; Rochester, N. Y.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Mobile, Ala.; Hartford, Conn.; Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Maryland, Georgia, Illinois, Virginia, Michigan, and Washington.

Mr. President, I invited the Commerce Department to give me certain information, and I have that information. I suppose that the Department of Commerce will be criticized, but I asked for this information, and it is perfectly proper for an official of the Government to give information if a Member of Congress asks him for it.

The other day the Senator from Tennessee called the attention of the Senate, after the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and I had made our representations, in regard to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to the increased appropriations for it in various years beginning with 1921. He pointed out that in 1921 the appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce amounted to \$1,211,000; the next year, \$1,694,000; then \$2,568,000; and so on from year to year, until the present year they have reached the sum of \$5,000,000.

I concede that, Mr. President. The record is accurate. The statement of the Senator from Tennessee is correct. It is true that the appropriations for this bureau have increased from year to year until now they are at least four times as much as they were 10 years ago.

That does seem like an enormous increase in appropriations. The casual examiner might regard this is a wasteful use of money and a strange increase in appropriations. But let me show you what has happened.

The purpose of this bureau is to aid manufacturers, farmers, and all producers in this country to find markets abroad for what they have produced here. It is exactly as if a man had a manufactory of furniture, and in order that he might sell his furniture he established showrooms in foreign cities and sent out salesmen to attempt to sell the products of his endeavor.

This bureau has operated in two ways. Through its foreign agencies it has received applications from concerns, establishments, and individuals in Europe stating that a given applicant desired to become the distributor of American automobiles or typewriters or any other kind of factory product, or farm product or foodstuff. Such applications have been brought to the attention of American producers by the foreign offices. The applications have been stimulated by the activities of the agents of the department in foreign lands.

Likewise the local offices in this country have made studies of the various manufacturing and agricultural establishments and institutions and industries in the territories round about the local offices. Perhaps to the local office has gone the man who makes a certain type of shoes or of clothing or of shirts or collars, whatever it may be. This manufacturer has said, "I want to find a market somewhere in the world for these products of mine." By the cooperation of these domestic and foreign offices there have been brought together those on the other side who can use our products and those on our side who make the products.

Let me tell you how popular that has been with our people.

In 1921 and 1922, when the appropriation for this bureau was only \$1,211,000, there were 506,000 individual services rendered. That is, 506,000 applications were made by individual concerns for aid in the distribution of their wares. The cost per service then was \$2.38.

See how the popularity of this service has increased. See how many more applications have been made for service. It is startling how the demands have grown.

There were 506,000 applications in 1921. By 1923 the number had increased to more than a million—1,169,000. The next year there were 2,000,000 applications. By 1928 the individual services demanded had increased to 3,342,000, and this year 4,000,000 have asked for this service. So, if we take the cost per service, where it was \$2.38 10 years ago it has decreased to \$1.28 to-day.

There has been that decrease in the cost of individual service because of the demands made upon this bureau. Think of it, Senators! Four million institutions or individuals in this country have made use of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce during the past year—4,000,000!

During the past year the bureau has succeeded in establishing 2,873 new agencies and sales connections for American firms as a result of its services. Nearly 3,000 agencies in America made connections with European establishments in order that their sales might be extended by reason of that export service.

During the past year 942,580 trade opportunities were brought to the attention of American exporters. Nearly a million trade opportunities in Europe were brought to the attention of American exporters through the operation of this bureau. Listen to these figures—

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. That I might not disturb the presentation of this important question by an independent speech, I take the liberty of offering to the able Senator from New York the full information sent me from my city of Chicago, where the Association of Commerce and the officers of the Continental-Commercial National Bank protest against the omission of this item of appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce on the ground, as they contend, that under the previous system of things the consul represented commerce and to some extent became its advocate, but that now, since we have passed a law that merges the consul into an office where he may any day expect to be made a secretary of legation and therefore a diplomatic officer, he will not deign any further to represent commerce; and therefore we have no representation whatever, as we previously had, by virtue of the new epaulets that have been adjusted to the consul, shifting him into the possibility of a diplomatic career, for which he hopes by day and of which he dreams by night.

Therefore, unless these offices, which are some form of an adjunct to commerce, are in some degree continued, it is represented to me, to bring forth to this honorable body, there would be no one whosoever throughout our European commercial ports to speak in behalf of American commerce.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator. That bears directly upon the argument I intended to make. What the Senator from Illinois has said so well gives emphasis to my plea.

Let me state that last year we received in this country \$57,000,000 in new business, secured for American concerns by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. That was done at an expense of \$5,000,000. We received \$11 for every dollar we invested. The estimate is that there will be a return of one million and a half dollars in income taxes this year on that same investment of \$5,000,000.

Mr. President, it stands to reason that to destroy this bureau is to threaten the life of the American export business. I can not conceive it possible that the Senate of the United States would wish to be a party to that calamity.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit me to comment on the observation offered by the Senator from Illinois, which at least in some degree must be an inadvertence? The Consular Service of the State Department not only continues to deal in trade reports upon a very substantial basis, it not only continues to make trade contacts, which are reported at a total of \$19,000,000 in net advantage to American concerns during the past year, but, in addition, the Consular Service of the State Department, continuing its trade function which it monopolized for so many years, is entirely depended upon by the foreign service of the Commerce Department to formulate the World Trade Directory, which is virtually the Dun & Bradstreet's of the world, involving contacts with 585,000 different foreign firms.

The suggestion I am taking the liberty of submitting, both to the Senator from New York and to the Senator from Illinois, is that there might well be a study to determine whether both of these relatively competitive agencies in the foreign field might not well come to a common basis and be stabilized and unified, so that in all of these respects we have but one spokesmanship beyond our borders.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to make that observation.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator to pardon me for making an observation to my esteemed friend from Michigan, to say that as I can not speak of knowledge I can only give the report that the consuls, as the Senator says, make a mathematical and something of a historical report, but the report they make as consuls is gathered from the work done by these commercial individuals of whom the Senator from New York has been speaking; and while the consul assumes to make the report and to take, perchance, the credit of the result, his is but the report of the labors of others, and he has a right officially to present them as the consul. But my eminent friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan fails to observe that it is the report of the consul of what has been done, without any reference or statement of who did it. It is claimed by those who report to me that it is the commercial officials who do it, and the consul merely makes the report of the consequence and the result. I do not know how true that is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Illinois will readily see that he is describing a precise type of competition which should not exist. If it does exist, as he indicates, that is one more reason why in this economy program the sensible thing to undertake is to consolidate the competing forces of the Government, and thus seek increased efficiency at reduced cost.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, how long would the diplomatic agent abroad have any diplomatic standing if he were using his office to develop business for the United States?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, our consuls abroad, although they are Foreign Service officers, are not considered to be diplomatic officers.

Mr. COPELAND. Nevertheless their work to a great extent is along diplomatic lines. My contention is that if we desire to continue our export business, which even in 1931 was two and a half billion dollars, the largest industry of America, next to agriculture, if we desire to continue that export business and to increase that export business we must have agents on the other side who are devoted to that one thing and nothing else. They should not be diverted at all by the diplomatic activities which are incumbent upon a consul in a foreign country.

Mr. President, I take it the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois is well founded, and certainly his view is the experience and the belief of every export concern I know of in this country. They are begging every-

where that this activity may be continued, in order that this foreign business may be brought to us.

In connection with our export trade, which I have spoken of as, next to agriculture, the chief business of America, there are 1,400,000 workers. More than a billion and a half dollars in wages are paid to the persons engaged in making goods for export trade.

Mr. President, I call attention to this further fact: Great Britain and Canada spend more per capita on export-trade production than the United States spends. Great Britain cut expenses 11 per cent as an economy measure, but did not curtail the expense of activities along this particular line. She made cuts in higher salaries and allowances, but no effort was made to reduce the activities of the British agents developing business for British industries.

I ask that the statement of the facts I have before me regarding the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, given to me by the department by request, and also page 3 of the little pamphlet I hold in my hand, which show the relation of the cost of appropriations to the service rendered, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME FACTS REGARDING BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Two thousand eight hundred and seventy-three new agency and sales connections made by American firms last year as a result of the bureau's services can be valued at \$500 to \$1,000 each.

One hundred and ninety-three thousand five hundred sales-information reports distributed annually. Worth \$1 each at least.

Seven hundred and thirty-one thousand five hundred and two trade lists distributed.

Nine hundred and forty-two thousand five hundred and eighty trade opportunities brought to attention of American exporters.

Fifty-seven million dollars in new business secured for American concerns by bureau last year. Bureau spent \$5,000,000; \$11 return for each \$1 invested.

One million five hundred thousand dollars estimated income tax on above business.

Two billion five hundred million dollars export trade 1931. Largest industry next to agriculture.

United States leads the world as an exporter despite decline.

One million four hundred thousand workers involved in export trade with more than one and one-half billion dollars in wages.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-one exports declined 37 per cent in value over 1930, imports 32 per cent; on quantity basis much less severe, exports only 20 per cent, imports 10 per cent over 1930. Industrial production fell off 16 per cent; freight-car loadings 19 per cent.

Twenty-five billion dollars in commercial transactions as result of export trade.

Seven million dollars collected annually by Department of Commerce in fees and turned into Treasury.

Twenty-four thousand export firms served currently by bureau. Forty-six thousand firms make daily use of bureau's domestic trade services.

One hundred thousand dollars' worth of bureau publications sold annually.

Eighty per cent of bureau's services for "little fellow."

Three million nine hundred and sixty-six thousand services rendered by bureau during 1930-31.

Cost per service dropped from \$2.38 in 1921-22 to \$1.28 in 1930-31.

Appropriations 1930-31 four times 1921-22. Services eight times.

One and one-tenth per cent of total United States Budget for Department of Commerce.

Eleven per cent of total for Department of Commerce for Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Great Britain and Canada spend more per capita on export-trade promotion than United States. Great Britain cut expenses 11 per cent as an economy measure but did not curtail staff or activities. It was applied to cuts in higher salaries and allowances.

One million five hundred thousand dollars contributed by industry for cooperative work with bureau, i. e., Drug Store Survey, 31 trade associations put up \$75,000, bureau \$25,000.

Details regarding growth of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Appropriations for 1920-21.....	\$1,211,000
Estimated Budget for 1932-33.....	4,870,000

Increase.....	3,659,000
---------------	-----------

But services rendered by Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce increased twice as fast as appropriations:

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Industrial services rendered, representing the "inquiry curve"	Cost per service
1920-21.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
1921-22.....	\$1,211,000	\$506,000	\$2.38
1922-23.....	1,694,000	881,000	1.92
1923-24.....	2,568,000	1,169,000	2.19
1924-25.....	2,835,000	2,041,000	1.39
1925-26.....	2,994,000	2,033,000	1.47
1926-27.....	3,263,000	2,421,000	1.35
1927-28.....	3,722,000	2,771,000	1.34
1928-29.....	4,257,000	3,342,000	1.27
1929-30.....	4,540,000	3,632,000	1.25
1930-31.....	5,087,000	3,966,000	1.28
1931-32.....	5,334,000		
1932-33.....	4,870,000	(2)	
Increase, 1931 over 1921 (per cent).....	300	800	46

¹ No record. ² Not yet available. ³ Approximately. ⁴ Decrease.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, this is the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States. The situation is not such that I can state what I wanted to say earlier in the day, but I wish to take the privilege on Monday of inserting in the RECORD some very interesting letters of notable contemporaries of George Washington.

I thank the Senator from New York for allowing me to make this announcement.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator made the announcement. If George Washington, with his breadth of vision, were alive to-day and here to advise us, I am sure he would be urging us not to make any entangling political alliances with Europe but to get all the business possible from the European countries.

Mr. President, I beg all Senators to give thought to what I have said. I know it is as useless as baying at the moon to make any effort to change the pending bill. It is predestined and foreordained to pass as it has been written. But I do hope that these feeble remarks of mine may be of some use when we come to the conference, and that possibly from the conference may come more liberal support for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

I do not flatter myself that the amendment presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania, which I fully approved, will in any material way increase the activity of this bureau. But in this time of economic depression in America, American industry and American activities of every sort must be encouraged. Yet by the passage of this bill we are aiding the depression, taking the heart still further from those engaged in business in our country. I am regretful beyond words that it seems necessary that there should be any such economy as this; it is false economy, not true economy.

There are many activities of the Government which can be reduced so far as their appropriations are concerned; but when we do anything to interfere with the spinning of the wheels of the machines in our factories, and the belching of smoke from the chimneys of our factories, we are harming our country. It is the exercise of false economy, which will come back to haunt us.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, following the speech of the Senator from New York, some communications which I have received similar to that offered by him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., April 11, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate.

Although believing firmly in governmental economy hope nothing will be done which will cripple the valuable service given by Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

EDWIN S. SMITH,
Commissioner of Labor and Industries.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate:

The New England Shoe and Leather Association and our manufacturers generally, while believing there is abundant opportunity to eliminate unnecessary activities in most departments of the Federal Government, would be sorry to see any action taken by Congress that would seriously cripple the vital activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in its cooperative work with American business.

THOMAS F. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

BOSTON, MASS., April 12, 1932.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,

Senate Office Building:

While thoroughly in accord with increased Government economy hope you will use all your influence to prevent any panicky action that would cripple Commerce Department; although cost of this department minor factor in Government Budget it is doing wonderful job for American business. Any setback here would be dearly purchased economy.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BLUE PRINT AND
ALLIED INDUSTRIES,
PHILIP B. TERRY, *Vice President.*

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., April 11, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate:

Reduction to expenses Government agencies heartily indorsed, but we hope in the case of Department of Commerce reduction will not be so drastic as to eliminate eastern district offices believed to be rendering important service to industry.

SPRINGFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 11, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate:

Understand Senate contemplating reducing appropriation available Bureau Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Respectfully urge you refuse reduce their already small appropriation still further.

C. A. RICHARDS,
President C. A. Richards (Inc.),
Export Distributors for United American
Bosch Corporation, Springfield, Mass.

BOSTON, MASS., April 11, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate:

While I believe strongly in economy and all possible reduction of expense, it seems to me that the proposed reduction in appropriation for Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is relatively excessive and will seriously cripple the good work being done. I commend the matter to your careful consideration.

FRANKLIN W. HOES.

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass., April 16, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Being in position to know the nature and value of the work of the New England office of the United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, we have to-day telegraphed certain Senators as follows with reference to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill now pending:

"While New England industry and business generally earnestly desire balancing of the Federal Budget and look to the Congress to achieve this as promptly as possible, we urge that provision be made for continuance of district offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce on a basis that will not entirely deprive business of the practical and valuable assistance they render."

This telegram was sent to Hon. REED SMOOT, chairman Finance Committee; Hon. WESLEY L. JONES, chairman Appropriations Committee; Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, chairman Commerce Committee; Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, chairman Committee on Manufactures.

Sincerely yours,

DUDLEY HARMON,
Executive Vice President.

BOSTON, MASS., April 12, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I have been reading with a great deal of interest the comment that is emanating from Washington relative to the colossal task that is now confronting you gentlemen in the balancing of the National Budget. I thoroughly realize that you are bombarded from all angles with suggestions as to what you should do and what you should not do, and in sending you the word I am now sending, I do so with the sole thought in mind of possibly being helpful in offering information as to something I come in personal contact with practically every day in the week.

I am particularly concerned with the rather drastic cut that is contemplated in the provision for district and cooperative offices of the Department of Commerce. To the merchants of the country these offices have been of distinct value, and I think I am fairly safe in saying that they render more dollar for dollar value than any other governmental activity.

Their business is strictly in the promotion of American trade, both domestic and foreign, and in coming in contact with both domestic and foreign trade, such as I do in my business every day, I have come to look on the district office in Boston as an absolute essential to the proper conduct of trade. As an instance of the value of the district office in Boston, changes are taking place almost momentarily in regulations made by foreign countries as to what they will or will not admit into their country, whether or not the government of any particularly country will allow funds to go out in payment for American goods, changes in rates of duties and what not, all of which information the district office of the Department of Commerce keeps on file for immediate reference, and I very much fear should this service be too seriously curtailed it would work a real hardship on manufacturers in this district, attempting to properly conduct their trade abroad.

For instance, it has not been so long ago that one of our clients was sending a rather large order to Chile. Before letting the order go out, we checked up with the Boston district office of the Department of Commerce and discovered that the Chilean Government had put in a regulation whereby the consignee in Chile could only secure the permission of his government to pay the invoice on this merchandise at the rate of 2 per cent per month, and that if the shipper had made the shipment, he would have had to wait two years for his money. When I got this information, he decided not to ship, and it was a distinct saving of time and money to have such information available.

Of course, it could be said that such information could be obtainable from Washington if there were no such thing as a district office in Boston, and it is probably true, but it is much more convenient, and, in my humble opinion, much more economic that such information be readily available for people in a particular district rather than have to go to Washington for every bit of information that is needed.

As I started out to say in the beginning of this letter, I do not want to take the position of "viewing things with alarm" or burdening you with personal suggestions, but I think you would find on a check up that the sentiments I have set forth in this letter as to the real usefulness of some of the efforts of the Department of Commerce will be agreed to by practically all manufacturers and shippers in the New England district.

This letter is written with the idea of putting information in your hands as to the practical usefulness of something that should be retained if it is at all possible to do so and consistent with the attitude you are taking in regard to the momentous question that is placed on you to decide.

With cordial good wishes, I am
Very sincerely yours,

D. C. ANDREWS & Co.
By A. J. KELLEY, *New England Manager.*

LAWRENCE, MASS., April 25, 1932.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,

Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: Am inclosing an editorial from the Telegram regarding the work of the Commerce Department at Boston that might be interesting.

Respectfully,

R. W. EMERSON,
Editor Telegram-Sun.

[From the Lawrence Telegram, April 21, 1932]

AS WE SEE IT

After all, have you ever realized the personal service the Federal Government gives to its citizens? As a general rule we consider Washington too far away to be of interest except once in four years, when the President is elected, and occasionally when some discussion is up in Congress in which we are interested. As far as personal service is concerned, very few people realize there is any such animal. But some people have discovered the difference. Suppose you wanted to ship a Christmas present to some friend in another country. How would you learn of the procedure to send it and whether there is a duty to pay? Some time ago a man wanted to send a piano to his son in Italy. The son preferred an American make and the father desired him to have it. There are a large number of such nice and interesting questions that puzzle the people here, and many of them let the question slip because they do not know how to secure the information.

Washington is too far away, there is too much trouble to write, and no one would pay attention to a question anyway. That is the reaction of the average citizen. But you would be surprised to know that up in the tower of the customhouse in Boston there are offices that are busy every day answering simple questions, but questions of real interest, sometimes vital interest, to the one asking them. Some of these questions require patience, but they are answered by the Department of Commerce representatives.

While talking with an official there recently the phone rang. Only part of the conversation was heard in the office, but apparently the question was answered more readily than the inquirer expected. The inquirer desired to ship something to Canada and wanted to know the duty he would have to pay. Instantly the answer went back over the wires: "The duty will be 35 per cent, plus an excise tax of 6 per cent and a sales tax of 3 per cent." How could the man in the customhouse tower be so sure? He laughed and said he had answered the same question a dozen times that day. And there are plenty other questions.

A man came in who planned to move to Canada. He wanted to know about duty on the property he desired to take and about

an automobile. It took less than five minutes for him to learn that his personal property was not dutiable, but there was a question regarding the auto. If he had owned it six months, there was no duty. He was planning to buy an auto. Well, in that case it could not be a secondhand car, for they are not admissible for settlers, and a new car is subject to duty, plus excise, plus sales tax.

Of course, people and firms in trade understand the great service rendered by this department regarding conditions throughout the world. So complete is the information that there is no trouble to learn of markets in far-off Australia, China, or New Zealand. Department agents throughout the world gather this data for the benefit of the American manufacturer. As the same time, it is gathering a vast amount of information for any citizen who can use that information to advantage.

There are able men who are devoting their time and energy in assisting American industries on the road to prosperity. The prospect of trade expansion, building better local markets, the understanding of the market for the special product of the firm, and a score of others dealing with the intimate business in which a particular firm is engaged. Many a puzzling problem to a new, and often established, firm is solved through the aid of the department.

Possibly there is no more valuable service to the people of this country than that freely given by the Department of Commerce. During this period of world depression the department is of valuable service in advising manufacturers and shippers in their many problems. In fact, this department can be of still greater service with more able and experienced men at its disposal. It is in reality one Government service that is established to aid our industry and trade through such periods as we are passing, and do it safely.

It would naturally seem that, at the present moment, the department is of more importance than at any time of its existence. Foreign trade is important, but it must be safe and productive. Not only the major industries but there are many, many ways in which it helps the little industry; the one just beginning. It works on the theory that there are experiences that can be of value to the man just starting or developing a manufacturing plant. There are the vital questions of market, appropriation of effort and finance, and others, which may mean the difference between success or failure of the enterprise.

It would appear reasonable to presume that the best course for the Government, at this time, is to expand the service of this one department, because of the immense assistance it can be to our depressed industry. Our business men do not require so much help during prosperity. It is then that most any business runs itself. But, it is in times like these that greater effort on the part of the Government should be made to encourage and promote, through proper advice and experience, all industry.

Perhaps you do not know it, but there are services offered by the Federal Government that have the personal touch for every citizen of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is on its second reading and still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MEMORIAL

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial, signed by Franklin Reece, the Reece Buttonhole Machine Co., and sundry citizens (being manufacturers) of Boston, Mass., protesting against abandonment of the general manufacturers' sales tax in the pending tax bill and indorsing the economy program, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

TAX ON IMPORTED WOOD PULP

Mr. HASTINGS presented a telegram from the Jessup & Moore Paper Co., of Wilmington, Del., favoring the imposition of a tax on imported wood pulp, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., April 30, 1932.

HON. DANIEL O. HASTINGS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Understand some doubt whether Finance Committee will recommend tax on imported wood pulp to offset depreciated currency foreign nations off gold standard. Foreign pulp now delivered in this country much less cost than domestic manufacture. We have been obliged shut down our Maryland pulp mill indefinitely. Unless some relief is given immediately we must close our Delaware pulp mill employing several hundred men. Our Delaware mill operating only two days a week. Our former customers buying foreign pulp at low prices. If our pulp mills shut down permanently the farmers and producers in Delaware will have no market for pulpwood. Please confer with Senator JONES and try to help us.

THE JESSUP & MOORE PAPER CO.

SUPREME COURT OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Manila High Court Ceases to Function," and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with the request that they hasten consideration of the nominations of judges for the Philippine high court.

There being no objection, the article was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANILA HIGH COURT CEASES TO FUNCTION—WASHINGTON SENATE'S FAILURE TO CONFIRM SIX APPOINTEES LEAVES QUORUM LACKING—TRIBUNAL TO BE ENLARGED—TWO OF THE ORIGINAL NINE RECENTLY RESIGNED AND ONE DIED—ONE APPOINTEE OPPOSED

MANILA, April 29.—The Philippines were left to-day without a functioning supreme court.

The complication, which had been foreseen as a result of the failure of the Senate in Washington to confirm the new appointees, was precipitated when the court held its final session under its old organization with a membership of nine.

The death of Justice Charles Johns and the resignations of Justices Findlay Johnston and Norberto Romualdez left the court only seven members, one of whom is Acting Justice Carlos Imperial, who is filling the vacancy created by the death of Justice Johns.

Justice Ostrand was on a vacation in the United States, thus leaving the strength for the summer session at five.

The present impasse arose as a result of the legislature's action last year in raising the membership to 15. The supreme court is the only appellate body in the islands and was hopelessly overworked.

The first six appointments to fill these places were allowed to lapse in the Senate because of political pressure. Three new appointments were made recently, but confirmation of these also failed.

The court must take an enforced recess until July, since it now requires nine for a quorum, and unless the appointments are confirmed in the meantime the Philippines will continue without a supreme tribunal.

Agitation for action by the Senate on the new Philippine Supreme Court appointees has grown since the resignation of Justice Romualdez on March 16, when it was foreseen that a quorum would be lacking for future sessions.

Delay in the Senate has been attributed in part to opposition to José Abad Santos, one of the appointees. Newspapers have opposed him because he defended a drastic libel law recently passed by the legislature. He was accused by a Manila lawyer of using his position as secretary to Justice Romualdez to influence the trial of an embezzlement case. He filed an action for libel against his accuser.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 99) to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 624) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4291) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 625) thereon.

Mr. HASTINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3938) to provide for the transportation of certain juvenile offenders to States under the law of which they have committed offenses or are delinquent, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 626) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4020) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of practice and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases after verdict, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 627) thereon.

BANKING ACT OF 1932

Mr. NORBECK submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Banking and Currency to accompany the bill (S. 4412) to provide for the safer and more effective use of the assets of Federal reserve banks and of national banking associations, to regulate interbank control, to prevent the undue diversion of funds into speculative operations, and for other purposes, heretofore reported from that committee without amendment, which were ordered to be

printed as part 2 of Report No. 584, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Report No. 584, pt. 2, 72d Cong., 1st sess.]

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL AND FEDERAL RESERVE BANKING SYSTEM

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following views of the minority (to accompany S. 4412):

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has had under consideration S. 4412, "To provide for the safer and more effective use of the assets of Federal reserve banks and of national banking associations, to regulate interbank control, to prevent the undue diversion of funds into speculative operations, and for other purposes," and reported favorably thereon on April 23, 1932 (Rept. No. 584).

On behalf of the minority of the members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I am making this report in protest against the proposed extension of branch banking, without taking issue with the distinguished author of the bill, Senator GLASS, on other matters in the bill, in most of which I heartily concur, and some of which I deem very important.

In speaking of our banking system, we must keep in mind that we have (1) a system of national banks chartered and supervised by the Federal Government; (2) we have a competitive system, that of State banks, chartered and supervised by the States.

There is difference of opinion among well-informed people as to their comparative merits, and certainly there is a great desire on the part of certain people to wipe out the State banking system. What can not be done directly by law may be done by giving the national system such an advantage that the competitive State system can not exist.

Aside from the two general classifications, we might make further classifications, as follows: Unit banks, chain banks, group banks, and branch banks.

A unit bank may have a National or State charter. It is generally defined as an institution which is owned, controlled, and operated by residents where the bank is located, and has no affiliated institutions. This is the typical American bank.

The term "chain bank" is generally applied where two or more banks are owned and controlled by one individual and partnership (without a holding company or more centralized control).

"Group bank" is the proper term for institutions that have been growing up in many sections of the country of late years. If not a violation of law, it is certainly an evasion of law. A holding company is generally organized for the purpose of owning and controlling these banks. As a rule, the holding company owns over 90 per cent of such bank stock, but there remains a local organization and a local board of directors, subject, however, to the control of the holding company, which is located in some central place.

It is a well-known fact that shares in a bank carry a double liability with them on the part of the stockholder. As a rule the shares in a holding company do not carry this extra liability, though there are a few notable exceptions to this practice. I have in mind especially the Detroit group, who appeared before this committee and explained their system.

Branch banking is where a parent bank has one financial structure from which it operates the several branches or offices under set rules and instructions issued by the head office. The officers of the several branches have very limited powers of discretion.

FALLING PRICES

Since the war there has been a continual shrinkage in values and this has put a great strain upon our banking structure. Numerous failures have been taking place, and those, who for different reasons prefer the chain bank with the central control, are continually pointing to the banking systems of other countries. But all things considered, the American system has held up wonderfully well. Our Government has not come to the direct aid of our banking structure, such as has been the case in many European countries, where the governmental form of banking exists, where the taxpayers took the losses.

We are often reminded of the losses suffered by depositors in this country. That is true, and it is deplorable; but it is not fair to point to other countries for comparison. The American dollar is still at par, while the bank deposits in foreign lands have dwindled in proportion to the shrinkage of their currency value; in Canada it is 20 per cent, and in France it is 80 per cent. We have much over which to be happy, and do not need to be hasty about importing a banking system from foreign lands.

The so-called safety of the French, Canadian, or English system is simply one of percentage, and we need not be ashamed of the comparison.

It is not believed that the remedy lies in more centralization. When we take the history of the chain bank, group bank, and branch bank, many States in the Union have had debacles which are appalling. The greatest bank failure in this whole depression was in the case of a branch-bank system—a central bank with some 50 or 60 branches. On the other hand, while the losses of unit banks in the United States, due to overbanking conditions and the present financial situation, have been devastating, we have no assurance that such a condition may not arise again under a different form of banking, as each generation must learn its own lesson, and human nature, as a rule, has never been able to capitalize 100 per cent from the mistakes of the past.

BRANCH BANKS

Advocates of the branch banking system ignore the fact that such a system has never been tried in a country of 120,000,000 population 3,000 miles across. They ignore the tendency in this country to centralize control of everything, and especially of credit. I believe the branch banking system would put us at the mercy of the financial centers.

THE CANADIAN SYSTEM

We hear much about the Canadian system, which is the outgrowth of the British system, but we hear only the good side of it. However, we occasionally run across something suspicious even in these presentations. We are told that Canada has only 11 banks, with an average of about 400 branches, and that there have been no failures. This statement is not in accordance with the record, for they have had numerous failures.

An advocate of the Canadian system in a recent magazine article said they had had only 16 failures in 62 years. The branches are not counted when the failures occur, but let us take them at their own statement. They have 11 banks and they have had 16 failures; that is more than a hundred per cent.

We are told that these 11 Canadian bankers have during the last few years had a smaller percentage of failures than the banks in this country, and I think that is true. But we have a large number of banks in this country that have had no failures, and certainly we have one banking system here, not above referred to, that has gone through entirely without losses, and it has done an enormous banking business. The worst thing that can be said about it is that it has not furnished accommodation to the communities where the deposits were received. They have taken no risk. They have not been interested in building up the communities. If we had only such a system, we would make no progress in our development; we would slow down—we would come to a standstill. The system is the nearest comparable to the Canadian system. I have reference, of course, to the postal savings bank that drains the community dry of its cash.

One of our distinguished Senators, who has spent a great deal of time in Canada, told me privately he believed the natural resources of Canada were equal to those of the United States. Their growth has only been one-tenth the growth of the United States. I believe we are much indebted to the unit banking system for this difference.

I feel that section 19 of the Glass bill should be eliminated in its entirety. There is a movement on foot to control the banking industry of the United States by centralization. This movement might be termed not only national but international. Of late years this movement has been becoming more evident. The only way it can be accomplished, apparently, is through nation-wide branch banking and the complete elimination of the unit bank.

The unit banker has had a most prominent place in the development of the United States. By reason of his individualistic characteristics he has been able to mold himself to meet any possible situation. It has been through his foresight, strength of character, and belief in these great United States of ours that our country has become the foremost in commerce and industry. His endeavors have been most outstanding. The history of our country might have been different if our banking system had been controlled from Washington or New York.

Our dual system of banking has been one of the great motivating factors in making the United States the outstanding country that it is to-day. Our country is too large, too widely diversified, to expect one banking system to be so versatile as to deal with so complex a situation efficiently. The American people are individualistic and so should be our banking structure. The unit bank has a most definite position in our national welfare.

Two reasons have been advanced why we should have one system of banking:

First. The commerce of the United States should be financed in an orderly manner; must have a uniform system of banking under Federal supervision. Our past history does not prove the necessity of the same.

Second. That the Federal Government can not rely upon the voluntary cooperation of State banks and trust companies for the execution of a national policy. The record is clear that there has never been a time when the unit bank or the State chartered institutions have not upheld the hands of our Government.

The placing of our banking structure with the now overburdened bureaucracy in Washington is in direct violation of the principle of State rights. So far no tangible evidence has been offered that the passage of this section would be of value to the rank and file of our citizenry or would meet and stabilize the present situation. We have always the matter of politics, change of administration, Government in business, which can not be overlooked. History repeats itself.

The past several years a large amount of propaganda has been fed to the people endeavoring to educate them to national branch banking, and while the resolutions of some of our financial organizations were rabid in their opposition to branch banking, owing to steady pressure from without and within, their position has been gradually changing.

This plan appears to be a part of the preconceived plan for the elimination of the unit State bank and placing the control of our banking structure in financial centers. Those interested in controlling the banking structure of our country will find it far more easy to handle Washington than some 19,000 different banking corporations scattered throughout the United States. When banking and credit are centralized in a few hands, it is easier for

the powerful to get control of such corporations. In fact, Mr. Whitney, president of the New York Stock Exchange, testified before the Banking Committee that with good dollars he could "go out and buy every corporation in the world," and there seems to be no limit to the number of good dollars they control. This is most true.

DEMANDS FOR MORE POWER

Congress first allowed the national banks to have branches within the city in which they were located. The next step was to allow branches in metropolitan areas. Now the demand is made that we have what will mean nation-wide branch banking in its entirety, and plans have been offered which can be utilized in eliminating every unit bank by direct congressional action.

It is in the interest of the United States that a banking monopoly should not be created. The theory of siphoning credits through a branch-banking system has been exploded. Theoretically it functions perfectly until under pressure the pipe springs a leak. When the unit bank closes there is merely a "pop"; when a system of branch banks closes it is a detonation.

We only have to look back to the history of the endeavor to renew the charter of the Bank of the United States, with its branches in the then leading cities, during the Presidency of Andrew Jackson, to prove now, as then, that a banking monopoly headed in at Washington is not for the best interests of the citizens of the United States.

The placing of more power in the national-banking system is dangerous. Additional powers given this system would not redound to its benefit unless it is coupled with legislation that will cripple or eradicate our present State-chartered institutions. This fear of centralization in the hands of a few is possibly one of the factors behind the popularity of State-chartered institutions and general satisfaction of our dual system of banking.

The following figures speak for themselves:

On December 31, 1931, there were in the United States 194 private banks, 587 mutual-savings banks, 546 stock-savings banks, 1,245 loan and trust companies, and 11,240 State banks—total, 13,812.

The national system had 6,368 banks, with capital from \$10,000 up, of which less than 225 had a capital of \$1,000,000 or over.

As of the same time, national banks had on deposit \$19,210,000,000, which included \$260,000,000 of funds of the United States; while deposits of State-chartered institutions were \$30,486,000,000—a difference of \$11,175,000,000 in favor of State-chartered institutions.

Now as to capital structure. State-chartered institutions had \$175,000,000 more than national banks and a surplus of \$1,700,000,000 in excess of those of national charter. In other words, State-chartered institutions had more millions of surplus above the amount of surplus of national banks than the total aggregate of capital and national banks.

Further, take the period from March 25, 1931, to December 30, 1931. We find that during the intervening period the deposits in national banks decreased \$3,100,000,000, while deposits in State-chartered institutions decreased \$3,700,000,000. The per cent of decrease in each instance is: National banks, 13 per cent; State banks, 8 per cent.

Now, further, a comparison of national bank suspensions and State bank suspensions:

In 1931, prior to the figures cited above, there were 409 bank suspensions, as against 161 for the year 1930, or an increase of 154 per cent. While the State-chartered institutions had 1,809 suspensions in 1931, as opposed to 1,123 in 1930, or an increase of 60 per cent, there were reopened in 1931, 25 national banks and 250 State-chartered institutions, or 10 to 1. In 1930 there were reopened 5 national banks and 140 State-chartered institutions.

Now as to deposits. Time deposits in national banks, including deposits of the Post Office Department in national banks, in December 30, 1931, were \$7,594,000,000, as opposed to time deposits in State-chartered institutions of \$18,430,000,000, or, roughly speaking, 2½ to 1 in State-chartered institutions. In the Postal Savings System, at the end of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1931, there was on deposit averaging \$500 for each depositor, an aggregate of \$347,000,000, an increase of \$172,000,000 for the Government's fiscal year. Eight hundred and ten million dollars of the deposit shrinkage in State-chartered institutions were in savings accounts. The number of savings depositors decreased by one and a half million. Now, obviously, the million and one-half depositors who ceased having savings accounts in State-chartered institutions did not rush to the post office, for the increase in the number of postal savings depositors during the same period was 304,000, or less than one-fifth.

LIQUIDATING CORPORATION

It is hoped that a liquidating corporation will be the means of more prompt payment to depositors of some substantial part of their equity as soon as a bank is closed. It is not a guaranty of bank deposits, though it may point in that direction and, therefore, be subject to much criticism.

GUARANTEE OF DEPOSITS

The State banking system is threatened from another angle, and that is the great demand now on the part of the national banks to have guaranty of deposits. The request is based on the plea that it will restore confidence; but I do not hesitate to say there are national banks that would like to unload their losses on the Federal Treasury, and among them are some large ones; and where the bank is a large one, the taxpayer would be assuming a big

burden. One of the purposes is to give the national bank a certain advantage over the State bank and destroy our dual system of banking. It is an indirect and an insidious way to do that which they dare not attempt to do directly.

The writer believes that guaranty of deposits may sometime become a reality, but it is quite convincing from the experience of many States that tried the bank guaranty law that a more careful approach to the subject must be made, and certainly it must be considered a form of insurance; therefore the two fundamental principles of insurance must be recognized: (1) No loss must be underwritten which can not be paid; (2) no risk should be assumed at 100 per cent value—75 per cent would be a safer figure. The depositor who could get 75 per cent cash would be fortunate indeed compared to some of those who wait many years on the slow liquidation of a receiver.

There are members of this committee who favor guaranty of bank deposits who would hesitate now to have the Government take over bank losses and also to destroy the State banking system, for State banks would not be included in the program for guaranty.

The depression started in agricultural sections brought down thousands of banks. These people have taken their losses. They protest against helping to pay the losses that are now threatening other sections.

PETER NORBECK
(For the minority).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the 29th instant that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 194) for the relief of Jeff Davis Caperton and Lucy Virginia Caperton.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4539) granting an increase of pension to Nathan J. Barwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4540) granting an increase of pension to Kittie B. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 4541) granting a pension to Lizzie Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) relating to the manufacture of grasshopper poison; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RADIO ADDRESS OF EX-SENATOR JOSEPH I. FRANCE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD a radio address delivered by ex-Senator Joseph I. France, of Maryland, April 22, 1932, on the Coercive Power of Federal Patronage and Legality and Moral Force of the Preferential Primaries for the Nomination of Candidates for the Presidency of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and it is as follows:

THE COERCIVE POWER OF FEDERAL PATRONAGE AND LEGALITY AND MORAL FORCE OF THE PREFERENTIAL PRIMARIES FOR THE NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

It has been repeatedly stated that it would be impossible to prevent the renomination of Mr. Herbert Hoover for the Presidency at the next Republican National Convention. Why? Is it because he has made himself popular? No! Is it because his administration is a success? No! Is it because his renomination is desired or thought advisable by the outstanding party leaders? No! It is boldly stated that he will be able to force his renomination through the use and abuse of Federal patronage. How is the power of this Federal patronage exercised? Mr. Hoover implicitly demands that those who have been appointed by him to lucrative Federal positions lay aside the high and important duties, as servants of the Republic, and devote themselves to pernicious, vicious, and possibly illegal activities to promote his renomination. Thus we find the Postmaster General enjoying a high and responsible position and a large salary laying aside his duties and devoting himself to the fine art of political manipulation to secure the renomination of his Chief, by whose grace he holds office. Thus we see, in the State of Maryland, the collector of internal revenue, Mr. Galen L. Tait, devoting his time, which belongs to the people of the United States, to the perfecting of an organization in the State of Maryland to secure the renomination of Mr. Hoover. By his very official position the collector of internal revenue, by implication, may exercise a certain coercive power over the electorate. He receives the income-tax blanks, collects the revenue, and has general supervisory powers and some discretion as to whether

he should receive those returns as regular and just. As collector of taxes he is in a position of power.

Under all the ancient oppressive governments of earth the tax-gatherers have been the oppressors of the people. Under this new scheme of things the collector of internal revenue is not merely the head of a large organization of subordinates who aid him in the collection of taxes, but through his coercive power over them he makes himself the head of a powerful political organization. Such action can not be defended as moral. It is a question whether it could be defended in a court of law. If, however, the collector of internal revenue, at the time when he appoints a subordinate, demands a resignation in blank in order that he may be able to control the subordinate's political activities, he is then committing a criminal act. I asked a prominent politician this afternoon if the Hoover people had opened any headquarters here. He said, "No; they have no headquarters except the custom-house. Mr. Taft's offices are headquarters."

Moreover, it is believed that in certain instances the promise of office is being used contrary to law to control the political activities of certain citizens. It is reported that the postmastership at Baltimore is being kept vacant and that it has been hinted to a number of aspirants that each may have a chance of appointment. The same condition has been reported concerning other promises of reward. Thus they hope to assist the candidacy of Mr. Hoover by dangling lucrative offices and juicy political plums before the noses of those to whom office means more than an efficient and uncorrupted Republic. By such methods Mr. Taft was renominated in 1912 over that valiant champion of good government—Theodore Roosevelt. In the subsequent election Mr. Taft carried but two States. A prominent nominal supporter of Hoover, in answer to a question as to whether Mr. Hoover could be re-elected is quoted as saying, "Mr. Taft carried Vermont and Utah, but Mr. Hoover will not do as well. He will lose Utah."

Such political methods as this resulted in the enactment, by several of the States, of presidential preference primary laws.

There has been a studied and continuous propaganda for weeks, emanating from apparently some one source, to the effect that the preferential primaries in the States for candidates for the Presidency of the United States are not binding. This statement has been so persistently presented to the American public in all of the press articles concerning the popular vote in the States that it becomes glaringly apparent that there are selfish and sinister motives involved, if not the malicious intent to becloud the issue and minimize the sacredness of the ballot in giving expressions to the will of the masses of our people.

In many of the States laws were enacted; the processes of election set up with all the formality of filing candidacies under strict stipulations as to the required number of voters in each State to sponsor each candidate. The elections have been held and are to be held under the strictest legal procedure as provided in the statutes of the States, but it becomes the duty of certain political headquarters to announce that the results of such elections are not binding upon the delegates elected to the national conventions.

Such interpretation of the laws of the States makes them not only a work of deception, if the interpretations are held to be true; not only a camouflage that would direct the public mind from the successful candidate under the preferential primaries; but, more than that, they make the procedure a violation of every moral and ethical principle and a mockery of justice.

In announcing my campaign for the Republican presidential nomination I did not leave the American people uncertain as to my principles, my ideals, and my practical platform of action. There is no public question confronting the masses to-day on which there may be doubt as to my position.

Under the orderly processes of law, those who have sponsored my candidacy have carried out the requirements of the law and my name has been filed in most of the States where preferential primaries are held.

In North Dakota, with 11 votes; in Illinois, with 61 votes; in Nebraska, with 19 votes, three States where the primary elections have been held, my name was filed by my adherents, and the proper official of each of these States must certify my name to the national convention as the popular will of the people in the preferential election for the Republican presidential nomination. In like manner in the other States where the preferential primaries are to be held, the will of the people must be certified by the States to the national convention. In an opinion rendered by the attorney general of the State of Nebraska, he states "There is a moral obligation on the part of the delegates to vote for a person indorsed for President in the primaries."

In an opinion rendered by the attorney general of the State of Illinois, under date of April 14, he quotes paragraph 393 of chapter 46, Smith-Hurd's Revised Statutes, 1931, which is section 29 of the primary law, and reads in part as follows:

"Provided, That the vote for President of the United States, as herein provided for, shall be for the sole purpose of securing an expression of the sentiment and will of the party voters with respect to candidates for nomination for said office, and the vote of the State at large shall be taken and considered as advisory to the delegates and alternates at large to the national conventions of respective political parties; and the vote of the respective congressional districts shall be taken and considered as advisory to the delegates and alternates of said congressional districts to the national conventions of the respective political parties."

The deputy attorney general of the State of Maryland in an opinion rendered April 14 said:

"The results of a presidential primary election in this State are binding upon the delegates elected to the State convention,

and also the delegates selected by the State convention to the National convention." And further, "the delegates of such party selected by such State convention to the national convention of such party from the State of Maryland shall be instructed and bound to vote as a unit in the national convention for such candidate for President so selected as the choice of the State of Maryland as aforesaid, and such delegates shall continue to vote in such national convention for the choice of the State of Maryland as aforesaid for President as long as in their conscientious judgment there is any possibility of his being nominated."

In the State of Ohio each candidate for election as a delegate or alternate files, along with the declaration of candidacy and certificate, a statement in writing in the following form:

"I hereby declare to the voters of my political party in the State of Ohio that, if elected as delegate to their national party convention, I shall, to the best of my judgment and ability, support that candidate for President of the United States who shall have been selected at this primary by the voters of my party in the manner provided in this chapter as their candidate for such office."

And the attorney general of the State of Ohio in an opinion has said:

"The Secretary of State shall canvass the returns in the manner provided by law for canvassing the returns in the case of candidates for nomination to State offices, and shall forthwith certify the results of such canvass as regards the candidates for nomination in such political party to the persons chosen as delegates or alternates to the national convention of such party."

Invariably the opinion is expressed on the highest authority of the officials of the States that there is the moral obligation for the delegates elected in the preferential primaries to vote for the candidates for President, under the instructions of the people, as expressed through the ballot, a procedure which is the very bulwark of the fundamental principles of the Republic as enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution of the United States, and in the State papers of the Chief Executives of the Nation who have upheld the principles and doctrines of government formulated by the fathers of the Republic.

Notwithstanding the studied propaganda to which I have referred, in the eleventh hour, so to speak, prior to the primary in my own State—the State of Maryland—Mr. Hoover, the present incumbent of the high office of President, has filed; and notwithstanding further that in all the other States he has not had the courage to submit his cause to the popular vote of the people. He did not file in North Dakota. He did not file in Illinois nor in Nebraska. My name was filed and the votes of these three States in which the primary elections have already been held belong to me by every legal process of the State and by every moral obligation. Mr. Hoover would not file in Pennsylvania. He did not file in Ohio. He did not file in New Jersey. He did not file in West Virginia. He did not file in Oregon. In those States my name was filed by my adherents, under due processes of law. The time limitation for filing having expired, the votes of those States will be certified to the national convention and under legal processes and by moral right the votes of the delegates of those States must be cast in favor of my nomination.

If the preferential primary votes in all of the other States are not binding, then why should Mr. Hoover file in Maryland? Is Maryland the only State where the primary is binding? Is it on the theory that the preferential primary in Maryland will be binding but in all the other States not binding?

It has been asserted by certain party leaders supposedly representing Mr. Hoover that the votes in the other States where the preferential primaries have been held and are to be held, notwithstanding the will of the people, will be whipped into line and cast in favor of Mr. Hoover. Have we reached the time in the United States when our moral fiber is so weakened that the President of the United States would commit the immoral act of demanding or even accepting the votes of the delegates that are legally and morally bound to another? It is being openly stated that the delegates to the Maryland State convention have been pledged, before their nomination, to support Mr. Hoover, regardless of the popular vote. In other words, when I win the votes of the people of Maryland indorsing my candidacy, is it the purpose of those delegates to vote for Hoover, contrary to the law and morals?

Are we ready as a nation to admit that the Republic is dead and that our democracy has yielded to dictatorship and autocracy? God forbid! I submit this question fairly and courageously to the people of my State, and I call upon them to so rededicate themselves to the principles of our Republic that they will repudiate the men, regardless of their high places, as committeemen, national legislators, or Chief Executive, who would violate the simple code of morals and thus undermine our scheme of government and ultimately destroy our institutions and civilization.

ADDRESS BY GOV. GEORGE H. DERN, OF UTAH

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have here an address by Gov. George H. Dern, of Utah, delivered at the conference of governors in Richmond, Va., on April 26. It is a very able address of a nonpartisan character, and, I think, will be of interest to the Senate and the country. I ask leave to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICA MARCHING ON

When the governors' conference met last year Pollyanna speeches seemed singularly puerile. By this time, however, we have become so badly bogged in the slough of despond that many of us have forgotten that there is a celestial city toward which we are struggling. I have a feeling that the time has arrived when we ought to brace up and make up our minds that America is marching on.

I suppose a nation's onward march is always intermittent and that when obstacles are encountered there must be pauses and readjustments before the march can be resumed.

I confess that I have lost some of my youthful trust in the old copy-book motto, "Truth is mighty and will prevail," and also in the theory that the world is constantly getting better. I am afraid it is not so automatic as that. If it were, "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome" would not have been submerged in the cruel ignorance and superstition of the Dark Ages. The world keeps getting better only so long as there are enough men and women actively working to make it better. An old prophet said, "Where there is no vision the people perish." He, too, saw that progress is not automatic but depends upon leadership.

The United States is still a young nation, full of vitality, with a great destiny yet to fulfill. We have prided ourselves upon the energy, the resourcefulness, the self-reliance, and the hopefulness of the American people. This is no time to lose that energy, that resourcefulness, that confidence, and that optimism. Let our young Nation keep them, and "youth will be served."

How better can we observe the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington than by emulating his lofty determination to overcome all obstacles? Are our times any more discouraging than were the dark days at Valley Forge? Have we become a nation of cowards and weaklings, who can find no better occupation than to sit and repine? That was not the spirit which won the American Revolution, and that is not the spirit which will carry America forward in 1932.

America must march on. The depression has shown us that there are maladjustments, very serious maladjustments, in our so-called democracy. Perhaps it is well that these parlous times have thrown them out into bold relief so that we can all see them. Perhaps it is well that we have been forced to realize that if America is to march on, these maladjustments must be corrected.

We have two schools of thought in this country. The one merely wants to tinker up the old machine so it will run a little while until it breaks down again. The other wants to let its feet be guided by the lamp of experience and make such changes as to assure us that the machine shall not break down again—at least not in the same weak spot. The one would disregard all the shameful injustice of the past and present, and stand pat. The other would strive for progress and a square deal for all.

I heard an English lecturer recently define a pessimist as one who sees a calamity in every opportunity and an optimist as one who sees an opportunity in every calamity.

Let us not become a nation of calamity howlers. Let us not permit ourselves to become steeped in an atmosphere of defeatism. Sound optimism and healthy common sense are an absolute necessity to-day. Without them we can not cure the ills of our society, and it is certain that democracy can not flourish in a sick society. We have all the symptoms of a sick society.

A friend of mine said the other day that society is like the old woman who dotes on her symptoms: The more she reads the more symptoms she discovers, and the more patent medicines she tries. If we can only exorcise the devils of gloom, fear, and despair, and treat our ills in a rational way, we shall hasten our restoration to economic health.

If, instead of looking for more fancied ailments, or sitting idly by waiting for God, or the weather, or a change of heart in the bankers to bring us relief, we adopt the psychology of health, with a will to do the things that are necessary to bring us back to health, we shall the sooner have America marching on again. The strong, hopeful, courageous, constructive, resourceful individuals who have led America forward to colossal achievement in the past must again exhibit those virtues and lead us out of this morass. The time calls for something more than petty, piddling palliatives.

Is it not a travesty to say that millions of good, stanch Americans must go hungry because there is too much food; that millions must be ragged and scantily clad because there is too much wool and cotton; that millions must be cold because there is too much fuel? And yet that is the kind of foolishness that we have been enduring for the past two years. We can not afford to be smugly content with our present system.

I do not look forward with equanimity to a future when there shall again be seven to ten million men out of work in the United States, with only this difference, that they shall be better supported in their idleness. That might be brought about by unemployment insurance, and would be a great improvement over what we have this year, but it would hardly be a cure at all.

Surely humanity will never be satisfied until business and industry are so stabilized and controlled that this wicked thing called unemployment shall be relegated to the limbo for discarded evils.

That is an easy thing to say but a tremendously difficult thing to accomplish. At any rate, it is a social ideal toward which we should be striving if we want America to become the land of social justice. Perhaps some far-reaching readjustments will have to be made in our business practices. The important thing is to

keep thinking about it and working at it. The greatest impediments to progress are apathy and indifference. These resist improvement and reform more effectually than do the interests which think they are going to be hurt by a change.

We must prevent panics. Alternate periods of prosperity and depression, which economists call the business cycle, may be inescapable; but surely man is not so helpless that he can not keep them within some sort of reasonable limits.

One way to prevent panics is to prevent booms, for a panic is merely the reaction from a boom. "What!" cries the individualist, "interfere with a citizen running his own business in his own way? Horrible!" Well, I am an individualist, too, and yet I reply, "What! Let a citizen run his own business in such a way as to drag his fellow citizens down to ruin and misery? More horrible!"

Unless we are willing to put a watchman on the wall to warn us of approaching danger, greed and avarice will again and again cook up their poisonous speculative broth to lay us low.

Unless we are willing to do something toward stabilizing business we shall keep right on letting our people make money and then taking it away from them and reducing them to poverty.

Unless we are willing to take some constructive step toward permitting or enforcing control of production we shall continue to have overproduction, with its aftermath of depression and the cruel suffering of unemployment.

Unless we devise some feasible method of controlling credit, speculative orgies will again bring on panics, with all their human wreckage.

Unless we improve our banking system we shall again, in some future panic, have 8,000 bank failures, with all their tragedies.

Unless we stabilize our monetary system we shall time after time wipe out the debtor class and paralyze the producer class.

We are in the habit of saying that commodity prices are down. It would be more accurate to say that money is up. It is up because it is scarce. We have as much gold and currency as we had three years ago, but gold and currency are only a very small part of our money. Most of our money consists of bank credits. If a bank makes a loan and places the amount to the credit of the borrower so that he may check against it, the result is just the same as if he had so much gold in his pocket. In 1929 we had \$40,000,000,000 of bank credits in the United States, and \$5,000,000,000 of specie and currency. To-day the bank credits are \$13,000,000,000 less than they were two and one-half years ago, which means that we have \$13,000,000,000 less money now than we had then. The result is that the dollar has become scarce, and hence dear, and when the dollar goes up in value, God help the poor fellow who owes debts and taxes, for those debts and taxes are still payable in the same old dollar, and he must get that dollar, no matter what he has to pay for it. He must sacrifice his crops, or his manufactured products, or his stocks and bonds, or his real estate, or his labor for whatever they will bring in order to get the dollars with which to pay his obligations.

We scoff at Germany for inflating her currency after the war by means of the printing press, which enabled her debtor class to pay up easily in depreciated money but ruined the creditors and investors. That sounds very unjust, but are we doing any better? We are doing the same sort of thing, only on the other side. We are contracting our currency and ruining the debtor class by forcing payments in appreciated money. Which is worse, to ruin the creditors or to ruin the debtors? Of course, it is a conscienceless proceeding to ruin either one. We shall never make even a pretense of dealing justly by our people until we prevent situations like the present one when, as Prof. Irving Fisher said the other day, each dollar of debt has grown to be a dollar and a half. In other words, we need a stable or fixed dollar, so that when a man pays his debts he shall pay what he promised to pay—no more and no less.

The present depression is not due to any one cause. Indeed, many diagnosticians have a tendency to confuse cause and effect. In other words, they cite certain things as causes of the depression which are actually results of the depression. Nevertheless, some of the effects of the depression have become causes of our failure to recover from it.

I sometimes think every Senator and Congressman ought to have a trained economist on his secretarial staff and ought to listen to his advice rather than to the special pleas of privilege hunters who are looking out only for No. 1. Of course, there are economists and economists, and I do not mean that they should all belong to the same school, but they should all understand economic principles.

Business executives do not pretend to all-wisdom on every subject under the sun—they hire and rely upon experts, engineers, chemists, accountants, appraisers, economists. All our problems are economic problems. Why should they not be solved by experts instead of being messed up by amateurs? Winston Churchill says the task of the statesmen is to decide where to go and then to leave it to experts to figure out how to get there.

Some Members of our National Legislature, after years of service, become specialists on one or two subjects, but they must vote on all subjects. Too often they vote on "hunches" rather than on exact knowledge.

I started out to make an optimistic speech, but not a Pollyanna speech. Perhaps I have put more challenge than optimism into it, but I have not meant to do so. Worn-out and discredited economic and political maxims and fetishes we must cast aside. Constructive measures to overcome existing evils we must not be afraid to try. Social justice must be our goal.

I repeat that I think we have the strong, hopeful, courageous, constructive, resourceful individuals in the United States who will lead out so that before long we shall again see America marching on.

NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to authorize the building up of the United States Navy to the strength permitted by the Washington and London naval treaties.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 3 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until Monday, May 2, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1932

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou art infinitely worthy, Lord God Almighty, because all Thy judgments are just and true. Vouchsafe unto us this day the presence of Thy Holy Spirit. Let us not be diverted by the immediate aspects and circumstances of life. Take away any distemperance of controversy, of conflicts, of passions, and help us to consecrate to our Republic the whole strength of our honor and wisdom. May we always adorn our estate with manliness and unselfish devotion. O God, lead us to be single-hearted, clear-eyed, without confusion, without haste; thus may we pursue the path of our duty. May we arise as messengers of a better day, of an unconquerable people whose hearts beat in the deepest sympathy with world redemption. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7119. An act to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of the statue of Charles Barnet Aycock, presented by the State of North Carolina, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution making funds available for grasshopper control.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8083) entitled "An act providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1932," and for other purposes.

UNVEILING OF MONUMENT TO JOSEPH HEWES

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] at Edenton, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the House, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a very able and delightful speech made by the Hon. SOL BLOOM, of New

York, at Edenton, N. C., on April 28, at the unveiling of the statue erected by Congress to Joseph Hewes, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. In a large measure the success of the occasion was due to the interest and untiring efforts of Mr. BLOOM as associate director of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. SOL BLOOM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR UNITED STATES GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

I see all about me the pride and pleasure which the good people of this historic city have every right to take on this occasion. But it is my rare privilege to draw from it a pleasure that is probably greater than that felt by anyone else who is present.

On the program of the day I am put down as responding to an address of welcome. I have certainly had a welcome here that stirs every fiber of my being.

But in turn I bring a welcome and a blessing to you—a welcome that comes to you from the entire United States.

The welcome I bring you is for the important addition you are making here to this tribute our people are pouring forth this year. That is why I may claim to enjoy a pleasure even greater than your own.

I feel all the pride that you feel. And to that is added the pride of all the millions of good Americans in our country. For the unveiling and dedication of this monument to Joseph Hewes takes appropriate place among the most important of all the celebrations of the year.

Joseph Hewes played a pivotal part in the life and labors of George Washington, whose friend he was. The shining patriot who lived here, and forever adorns the history of your city, was far more than a mere passive signer of the Declaration of Independence.

We have it on the authority of John Adams that Joseph Hewes cast the deciding vote that led to the adoption of that immortal charter of our liberties.

The Continental Congress had already sent George Washington to chief command on the fields of battle where our national destiny was to be decided. In the Declaration of Independence it placed in Washington's hands full warrant for all he might be called upon to do in the winning of our liberties.

Without the vote of Joseph Hewes that warrant would have been withheld. But with the deciding voice of Hewes history perfected itself, and George Washington was armed with the last great power he needed—the power of an aroused, united, and flaming public opinion.

And the adoption of the Declaration of Independence was no easy matter. We are told by recorders of that great crisis that for months the question of independence had been discussed, and always the majority had been against it.

Clouds and uncertainties surrounded that deliberative body. Dangers hovered over it. What happened we have in the words of John Adams himself.

"For many days," says Adams, "the majority (against the declaration) depended on Mr. Hewes, of North Carolina. While a member one day was speaking and reading documents from all the Colonies to prove that public opinion, the sense of all, was in favor of the measure, when he came to North Carolina and produced letters and public proceedings which demonstrated that the majority in that Colony were in favor of it, Mr. Hewes, who had hitherto constantly voted against it, started suddenly upright, and lifting both hands to heaven as if he had been in a trance, cried, 'It is done, and I will abide by it.'"

And then exulting John Adams says, "I would give more for a perfect painting of the terror and horror upon the face of the old majority [against the declaration] at that critical moment than for the best piece by Raphael."

It is little wonder that George Washington made friends with a man of such courage.

There is, perhaps, little that is new that I could impart to you concerning the great patriot who lived here. The people of Edenton are in a position to give rather than receive information concerning him.

My errand here is rather to give you a sense of how this occasion fits like a jewel into the picture of an entire people. The Nation is rendering this year a great tribute to its greatest man, and to all the lofty-minded men and women who either aided him personally, or backed his efforts with that loyal public opinion which John Adams refers to with such exultation.

This year an entire Nation takes delight in going over its long and honorable history and feeling at one with its past. It gives us all a new dignity, a new feeling of stability, to turn and take note of our increasing age as a people, and watch the lengthening years stretch out behind us.

It enables us to feel that we are no longer a "young" or "new" nation, but now stand as a fixture among the firmest and strongest nations of human history.

And under all this new pleasure that has come to us, I see a deep and wholesome national instinct. It is more than a mere curiosity as to our history that is turning us back to the past, so that we may say to ourselves again: "Yes; these great men, these shining adornments to history, belong to us. They are Americans. We produced them."

We are turning back to them because we know they were leaders who triumphed in a difficult and dangerous time. Now